

point plan to the OAS Council for adoption by the nations of the hemisphere:

First. Curb movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout the hemisphere.

Second. Freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American banking institutions.

Third. Close the seaports of the hemisphere to nations engaged in seatriade with Cuba.

Fourth. Close airports of the hemisphere to airlines with flights into Cuba.

Fifth. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

I am today introducing legislation to express the sense of the Congress that the above plan be proposed to the OAS and adopted. The application of these steps will halt communism in this hemisphere.

MEXICO'S "CINCO DE MAYO"

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, May 5 is the anniversary of the day in 1862 when Mexican forces at Puebla beat back French troops in their march to capture Mexico City.

The Battle of Puebla is a chapter in the attempt of Napoleon III to establish an empire in Mexico with Maximilian of Austria on the throne.

The initial excuse for the French intervention was the refusal or inability of Mexico to meet its financial obligations. Mexico had signed a convention with Great Britain in 1842, and later with Spain and France, recognizing its indebtedness and agreeing to set aside a percentage of the customs receipts at Vera Cruz and Tampico for the payment of interest and principal, but as a result of repeated revolutions had defaulted on payments.

In June 1861, the great reformer, Benito Juarez, became President of Mexico. Finding himself financially unable to launch the progressive economic and educational problems he had planned and in need of money to suppress continuing guerrilla fighting, Juarez, in July 1861, suspended for 2 years payment on foreign debts. France, Spain, and England—Mexico's principal creditors—responded in October 1861 with a convention in which they agreed to occupy Mexican ports and collect the customs duties to secure payments of debts. At the same time they forswore any violation of Mexico's territorial integrity or its political autonomy.

Troops of the three European countries landed at Veracruz in early 1862. Dissension among the allies revealed that the French were using the scheme of debt collection as a pretext for imperial conquest. The British and Spanish Governments, convinced of the duplicity of France, ordered the withdrawal of their armed forces from Mexican soil. The United States, although alarmed by the French maneuvers, was reduced by the Civil War to helpless protestations.

The French troops began a march to the Mexican capital, apparently under the impression that the Mexican people would welcome their intervention—a view assiduously cultivated in Paris by defeated Mexican monarchists and clerical supporters. At Puebla on May 5 the French encountered their first resistance by the republican forces of Mexico.

Although the Mexican victory at Puebla was only a temporary setback for the invading French—a reinforced French Army occupied Mexico City on July 10, 1863—Mexicans regard the battle at Puebla with great sentiment. The fact that Mexicans, armed with ancient weapons and inexperienced in modern warfare, could defeat Napoleon III's well-equipped and renowned troops created a surge of national pride in Mexico, served as a unifying force in a nation rent by civil strife, and became a symbol of Mexico's resistance to foreign tyranny.

POLICY DECISIONS

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed when I read Lyle C. Wilson's column, "Who Knew About Castro?" which appeared in the press yesterday. I was impressed because of the manner in which Mr. Wilson raised a question which has been of great concern to me for some time, not simply because of the Cuban situation, but because it fits a pattern.

I remember back in 1960, on the occasion of the U-2 incident, when I spent considerable time and made a conscientious effort to learn the identity of the individual who made the original decision to make the false announcement concerning the nature of the flight on which Powers was forced down. It was most embarrassing and humiliating to me, as one American citizen, to be forced to admit that the United States had been caught in a lie. I did not make the speech that I had written and which I had intended making on the floor of this House, largely because I do not approve of speeches made by persons who are either uninformed, misinformed, or partially informed. But, I did go to Mr. Allen Dulles, then head of the CIA and conveyed to him my views on this matter, telling him that I believed this big lie had done more to destroy the confidence of our friends in many parts of the world than any other one thing which had been done in recent years.

I not only told Mr. Dulles that I believed someone had committed a grievous error, but I felt very strongly that the person who had made this decision, should be removed from any policymaking position in our Government. Mr. Dulles declined, possibly with very good reason, to identify the person who had made this decision, and furthermore declined to say whether the decision had been made by someone in CIA, State,

Department, Department of Defense, or the White House. President Eisenhower accepted the responsibility, just as he accepted the responsibility for backing the Castro government, but in both cases, I think most people would agree that the decisions were made by someone in a much lower echelon. I realize that hindsight is always much more accurate than foresight, but I still contend that those individuals who are responsible for making such tragic errors of judgment, should not be permitted to remain in positions where they can continue to do damage to this Nation.

The recent report of the Comptroller General has pointed up this weakness in our system of government where we continue to keep in positions of responsibility men who are incompetent and have proved this incompetence through decisions which have cost this Government billions of dollars.

Some weeks ago I called to the attention of this House, decisions of the GSA and the Post Office Department, to build federally owned buildings, the cost of which cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination. When I questioned a proposal in a prospectus issued by GSA in December, and pointed out some of the locations where I felt the expenditures could not be justified, they brought out a revised list, which omitted some 50-odd projects, and reduced the proposed expenditure from \$32 million down to \$20 million. An official in the Post Office Department was frank enough to admit that mistakes had been made, and that some of the projects could not be justified. Who made the original decision that they were justified? I have not been able to learn the identity of the person, and I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if you can learn.

Administrations change, but the policy remains the same. The policymakers are not Republicans and they are not Democrats—they are bureaucrats, regardless of which administration is in power. Particularly is this true in the State Department, and you have heard me from time to time speak of the arrogance of some of these in these policymaking positions who have appeared before committees of Congress.

I realize that the President cannot, and even the members of the Cabinet cannot, be familiar with every detail of administration of this Government, but I do say that when errors of judgment are made, and after they have been called to the attention of those who have to accept the responsibility, that some action should be taken to see that these mistakes are not repeated—at least not by the same incompetent individuals.

In closing, I would like to be assured that the individual who cleared Castro in the first place, and the man who made the decision to tell the big lie, is not still in a position where he can do further damage to this country of ours. I do not know that I would be as charitable as Mr. Wilson was in his column of yesterday when he closed with this comment:

This guy is no Communist. Just dumb.

The column to which I have referred reads as follows:

WHO KNEW ABOUT CASTRO?

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The prevailing humiliation and confusion of the United States invites some smart politician to ask a sharp question and to press for a clean answer. The question would be:

"How did this fellow, Castro, grab Cuba in the first place?"

This question would not launch a witch hunt. Neither would it be asked in a maneuver to tag some witless State Department understrapper as a subversive character with Communist tendencies. But it just might provide some valuable guidance for the future.

Enough is known of the State Department's attitude toward Fidel Castro when his revolution was developing to assure that it was not Communist subversion in the Department that caused the United States to foster Castro's takeover of Cuba on January 1, 1959.

It appears to have been stupidity. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee went through the motions of investigating the State Department and the events within it that led up to the tragedy of Castro's Cuban triumph.

Not much, if anything, came of that investigation, other than many thousands of words. No investigation was needed to establish that U.S. intelligence agencies had Castro's number long before his triumphal entry into Havana. Years before that our agents knew that the Beard was in cahoots with the Communists.

Intelligence reports on Castro's Communist sympathies were submitted in detail to the White House, to the State Department and to the Pentagon. Another question, therefore, arises: Did the President and top officials know of these intelligence reports or were the reports diverted or suppressed?

The answers to that doubletrack question would be interesting. If the reports were submitted and neither the President nor his top aids got them, who did get them? And why were they diverted from the top men? And, if so diverted, by whom?

Those are fair questions. They should have been asked and answered long since. But these questions seem not even to have been asked.

The word here in Washington is that intelligence reports on Castro's Communist affiliations were submitted regularly for the guidance of administration policymakers. All of this, of course, was during the Eisenhower administration.

The word is not so clear as to who actually received these reports. There is evidence, however, that these reports did not reach the top where the decision was made to encourage Castro and then to recognize him on his entry into Havana.

Taxpaying stockholders in the Government of the United States may not believe that such things can happen here. But they do happen. It is reasonable to believe that understrappers in Government cut off the Secretary of State, the President, and perhaps the Secretary of Defense, from information vital to them in judging Castro.

Somebody in Congress should have the gumption to get some simple understandable answers to all of the questions raised by the Castro goof.

If it happened the way it seems to have happened, the guy responsible probably still is in Washington somewhere with a desk, a title and a salary from the taxpayers—ready, willing and able to do it again. This guy is no Communist. Just dumb.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a good many millions of Americans each year celebrate the 3d of May as an anniversary day of freedom. They are the sons and daughters of Americans of Polish ancestry and Polish pride, who are still aware that in a Polish Constitution of 1791 the great doctrines of human freedom and national sovereignty were proclaimed deep in the continent of Europe.

It has been 172 years since Poland's people set forth the constitutional declaration that the purpose of the state must be to serve the will of those it governed, with the civil liberty of the citizens guaranteed.

This was a revolutionary declaration at the time and at the place, and it cut away the outmoded traditions of feudalism. The anniversary is observed by people of Polish ancestry throughout the world as the moment in history when their fatherland moved into the main current of modern concepts of government and society.

We have a special reason this year to spend a few minutes in recognition of the standard of constitutional freedom raised in Poland so many generations ago.

This is the centennial year of a great uprising in Poland against the foreign domination of the Russian czar.

The Polish people had little time after their constitution of 1791 to rebuild their society; the land and the government were taken over in 2 short years in the notorious third partition of the country between imperial Prussia and imperial Russia. The bulk of Poland's birthright went to the czar.

The Poles rose again and again in the long course of history against the occupying forces—just as they rose in 1944 when the Warsaw patriots revolted against the Nazi armies. In the 19th century, the greatest uprising was the revolt of 1863.

That year was memorable in history, for us as well as the Poles. It was the year of our Emancipation Proclamation.

In Poland, it meant the rising of the people against foreign garrisons. It meant the capture of arms and the other means of resistance. It meant 2 years of bloody and hard-fought insurgency in the name of freedom before powerful masses of the czar's armies moved in to suppress the rebels and hang the patriots. A quarter of a million sons of Poland were lost in the struggle—slain in pitched battles, executed, or captured and exiled to Siberia.

The spirit that motivated the insurgents of 1863 came from the doctrines embedded in and symbolized by the Constitution of May 3. That same spirit, we may be sure, lives in Poland today and finds its means of expression in many ways. We honor the cause of freedom everywhere by joining in this dual observance here—the anniversary of the

1791 Constitution and the centennial of the uprising of 1863.

SALUTE TO ISRAEL

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that no state in all human history has contributed to mankind in 15 short years anything comparable to the contributions of Israel as an example of democracy, tenacity and vitality.

The Israeli people, on their shelf of land in the cradle of civilization, have lived a life that is more eloquent than any attempt at verbal tribute. They have built a nation that is strong if small in population and area. They have stood as a bulwark of the concept of national sovereignty as well as the doctrines of human freedom. They have welcomed their people returning from the ends of the earth and demonstrated the validity of a good society united by an ideal.

It is a privilege for the rest of us, who share the concepts of our common ancient culture, to salute the State which has built its new foundations well and created a house which all men must gaze at with respect.

AMENDMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING ACT

(Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5692, introduced by Congressman WALTER, proposes many beneficial amendments to the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921. H.R. 5693 to H.R. 5701 are nine identical bills introduced in the House. Although the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WALTER, covers such worthwhile projects as preventing dumping from Communist countries, the bill is silent on the subject of the Tariff Commission's interpretation of the statutory requirement that there must be an affirmative finding of "injury to an industry." The Tariff Commission has ruled that dumping duties should apply to cement imported from the Dominican Republic. It should be noted that this is only the fourth injury-to-an-industry ruling by the Tariff Commission since 1958, although literally a hundred complaints have been filed during this period. The usually negative results have undoubtedly discouraged many U.S. manufacturers from filing complaints. In other words, the Tariff Commission's interpretation of "injury" has made the act generally ineffective.

If a U.S. manufacturer has a diversified line of products, it is practically impossible to find injury to the industry, although the market for one product may have been ruined by dumping. For example, if dolls are dumped by a foreign manufacturer into the U.S. market, it is most difficult to find injury to the toy

May 2

These special characteristics and creations of Israel have made her a lodestone for the best of the world's Jewish youth, not only from lands of distress and poverty but also from the affluent and prosperous countries. Moreover—and no less important—they have served as a model and example for the states that were established at the same time as Israel and in recent years, as well as for a number of ancient nations, in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

From the very beginning, Israel knew that independence is not the end but only a beginning—a gateway to development and progress, material and spiritual. The new states that have been established by the score in Africa and Asia have learned this truth from their own experience, and most of the problems with which they are wrestling are being solved in Israel. Thus in recent years Israel has become a school for thousands of young people from Asia and Africa, and Israeli instructors in military training, agricultural settlement, health and education have been working in scores of countries in Asia and Africa—and recently in some Latin-American countries as well. Israel does not possess the manpower, the wealth and perhaps the know-how of the United States, or even of the countries of Western Europe—not only of France, Germany, Britain or Italy, but even of Holland, Belgium or the Scandinavian countries. But in her spirit and her pioneering experience in development, education, social organization and health, she is no whit inferior to any country or nation in the world. Thousands of young people, from 36 countries in Africa, 14 in Asia (including India, the Philippines and Japan), and, in recent years, from 20 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as 5 in the Mediterranean basin (Cyprus, Greece, Persia, Turkey and Malta), have come to Israel to study her methods in agricultural settlement, the labor movement, youth education in Nahal and the "Gadna" Youth Corps, vocational training, cooperation, and various branches of science at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the Technion in Haifa and the Weizmann Institute in Rehovot. There are 634 Israeli experts in African countries, 137 in Asia, 75 in the Mediterranean basin and 23 in Latin America.

Israel realizes that her destiny is bound up with that of humanity as a whole, and her safety depends on peace among all the nations. In her own country she strives for the maximum ingathering of the exiles, the fructification and population of the wasteland, economic independence, the advancement of the individual, progress in education and science, and the establishment of a society built on liberty, equality, tolerance, mutual aid and love of humanity, as laid down in her state education law of 1953. In her foreign policy, she aims at maintaining friendly relations with all states, irrespective of their internal regimes, and permanent peace and cooperation with the neighboring countries, for the sake of peace and progress in the Middle East. Israel is convinced that only by closing the material and spiritual gap between the wealthy, highly developed nations and the poor, developing ones, by the establishment of true cooperation between all countries, will peace be established in the world, and she does all in her power to make her modest contribution to this partnership of all mankind.

Day Wielding Club on Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Massillon (Ohio) Evening Independent, who has some wise things to say about the operations of the Post Office Department:

[From the Evening Independent, Massillon Ohio, Apr. 25, 1963]

DAY WIELDING CLUB ON LEGISLATORS

The Post Office Department headed by Postmaster General J. Edward Day, has ordered the 68 largest post offices in the Nation to clamp down on new hirings and overtime pay and to curtail service if necessary.

This so-called economy move came because of cuts being contemplated by Congress in the Post Office Department's budget request for fiscal 1964, starting July 1.

And there folks you have a sample of the kind of pressure budget-cutting Congressmen and Senators are going to face in their efforts to whack sizable amounts out of President Kennedy's requested budget of \$98.8 billion for the next fiscal year, the largest budget ever presented by a President in the history of the Nation.

So the pattern shaping up in Washington today—as it has many times in the past when budget cuts were contemplated—is this:

Some Federal cabinet member or head of a department which is facing Congress' pruning knife will up and blast out an order to those in his department to curtail operations drastically, hire no new employees, curtail certain services and inaugurate other economy moves to meet the reductions a mean and pennypinching Congress is contemplating.

So almost before the ink is dry on the department head's curtailment orders, telegrams, phone calls and letters from here, there and everywhere protesting the curtailment, will deluge the Nation's legislators and the poor boys and girls—fearing the loss of a vote or two back home—will make haste to reconsider their drastic "pennypinching" and decide to restore at least 75 to 90 percent of the money they wanted to save.

It's an old technique—as old as the Nation itself—this method of putting the pressure on Congress and once again it will prove that a lot of Americans are not as anxious for budget slashes as they first indicated when the President announced his spending requests.

To say that the budget of the Post Office Department—or any other department of the Federal Government—cannot be cut below the amount asked by the President is pure poppycock.

There has never yet been a budget developed by the bureaucrats in Washington which could not be materially reduced without damaging present Government services one bit.

Budgets are devised to create more spending of taxpayers' money, rather than less.

So when Postmaster General Day sounds off with an order to curtail services in the

68 largest cities in the Nation he is just issuing the first blast in his campaign and those of his bureaucratic associates to bring down the wrath of the people on the heads of the poor Congressmen and Senators who would like to fry the fat out of the budget but who are afraid that in doing so they will find themselves frying in the fat among their constituents back home.

Because it serves all of the people in the country, the Post Office Department has quite a lever to exert on the people. Just think, Day warns, the Postal Department may have to cut out Saturday deliveries entirely unless Congress restores the \$92 million it planned to cut from the Department's \$4.9 billion spending program for fiscal 1964.

We consider Day's curtailment order so much propaganda and we hope the people of this country take it as such. And we further hope that those budget-paring minded Members of Congress stick to their guns and make the contemplated cuts stick.

That's the only way economy in Government can be reestablished in this Nation and our Federal Government cut down to size so that the billions of dollars received from taxpayers each year will meet the needs of the spenders in Washington.

Now it's going to be interesting to see just what happens during the next few weeks or months. Will Day go through with his threatened curtailments or will our vote-minded Legislators change their views on drastic curtailment of the Kennedy budget and hasten to restore the shekels they have been inclined to whack off the budget?

Unless there has been a great change in thinking among our Legislators in Washington, Mr. Day is going to be the winner and get back most of the money he says he needs.

And the Postal Department will once again wind up in the red as it has in years past, despite recent drastic increases in the cost of postal services.

Cuba

Law and the Quarantine of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and able legal advisor of the State Department, Abram Chayes, has in a few years in that position compiled an enviable record of great accomplishment including the successful advocacy before the World Court of the U.S. position on the financing of the United Nations activities in the Congo and in Israel. Because I know of his keen mind from the days that we were classmates in law school, I commend to my colleagues Abram Chayes' article in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, entitled, "Law and the Quarantine of Cuba."

LAW AND THE QUARANTINE OF CUBA

(By Abram Chayes)

The Soviet missiles in Cuba were a threat to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere. As such they endan-

with milk and honey but not with sufficient water, rich in rocks and sand dunes but poor in natural resources and vital raw materials, has been no easy task; indeed, practical men, with their eyes fixed upon things as they are, regarded it as an empty and insubstantial utopian dream.

But it seems that, besides the visible material reality, there is also a spiritual reality, which works out of sight. It is this reality that has been on our side and has refuted all the dismal prophecies that the unlimited immigration of impoverished masses, untrained and uneducated—as were the great majority of the immigrants during the period of the state, unlike those who came before the dreadful holocaust that destroyed 6 million of the European Jews with their spiritual and material resources—would bring ruin and disaster to the young state. This immigration indeed brought to Israel many sufferers from various diseases from Asian and African countries, but today Israel is in the first rank for expectation of life and birth. It stands at 70.67 years for men and 73.47 for women—which is higher than in the United States, Britain, France, Germany or any of the other highly developed countries, with the exception of the three Scandinavian lands, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, and Holland; and our mortality rate is the lowest in the whole world—5.7 per thousand.

In addition to half a million immigrants of European origin, we have absorbed over half a million from Asian and African countries, most of them entirely without capital, skills and education, brought up in backward ghettos and earning their livings by peddling—and they have created hundreds of villages in Galilee and the Jerusalem Corridor, in the south and the Negev, and built over a score of development towns where they work in every branch of industry and handicrafts, from textiles to electronic and petrochemical manufactures.

On May 15, 1948—the day the state was founded—we had 333 urban and rural settlements; at the end of 1962 the number had risen to about 876. At the first census, on November 8, 1948, the population was 785,678—716,678 Jews and 69,000 Arabs. At the second, on May 22, 1961, the total was 2,179,491—1,932,357 Jews and 247,134 Arabs.

In 1948-49 there were 146,017 pupils—134,887 Jews and 11,130 Arabs—in our entire education system. By 1961-62 the total had grown to 641,986—586,539 Jews and 55,447 Arabs. In post-primary schools (academic, vocational, agricultural and teachers' training colleges) there were 10,945 students, including 14 Arabs, at the establishment of the state, and 77,416 including 1,587 Arabs, in 1961-62.

Every boy and girl between the ages of 5 and 14 is obliged to attend kindergarten (at the age of 5-6) and elementary school (between 6 and 14), and education is free. Secondary education is not yet compulsory or free, but tuition fees are graded according to the financial position of the parents, and poor students receive scholarships from the government.

In 1949 the Weizmann Institute was established in Rehovot for research in all branches of the natural sciences, and its standards are not inferior to those of similar institutions in the most highly developed European countries.

Israel still faces grave educational problems, however, for the gap between the pupils whose parents came from Europe and America and those originating from Asian and African countries is still great; there are considerable economic and cultural differences between children from wealthy and developed countries and those from poor, backward ones, especially as it was the poorest from the latter who came to settle in Israel. Intensive efforts are therefore being made, by lengthening the school day in kindergartens

and elementary schools, establishing special schools, building dormitories for talented children from poor and large families, and other means, to close the gap; but, although the results of these efforts are encouraging, we still have a long way to go.

When the State was established, we found ourselves facing economic chaos. The Arab invasion, which was scotched only at the beginning of January 1949, the enormous mass immigration, which brought in some 700,000 immigrants in the first 4 years of the State—more than the entire population on the day it was created—the enormous expense and damage resulting from the war of independence, confronted the young State with appalling economic problems and shortages, which seemed to be almost insoluble. Until the end of the mandate, our country belonged to the sterling area. Our production, agricultural and industrial, depended largely on the presence of the British Army, which consumed but did not produce. There were economic ties of export and import with the neighboring countries. Complete isolation from the neighboring countries when independence came, together with the war and the Arab boycott, on the one hand, and the mass immigration that trebled our population in less than 4 years, on the other, faced us with a growing shortage of housing, food, employment, teachers, schools, and hospitals. A superhuman effort was required to overcome these tremendous shortages, and although we cannot claim to have succeeded 100 percent even at the end of our 15th year, by the end of the first decade we had already broken the back of the crisis. Today all sections of our economy, agriculture and industry, land, sea and air transport, are expanding, branching out into new fields and improving their efficiency; there is full employment in the country, and in some places there is even a shortage of labor.

The state budget, which in 1948-49 stood at I£20,855,000, amounted to I£2,990 million (about \$1 billion) in 1963-64.

The cultivated area, which covered some 400,000 acres (of which 75,000 were under irrigation) in 1948-49, totaled almost 1,030,000 acres, of which 380,000 were irrigated in 1962-63. The afforested area increased from 13,000 acres in 1949 to over 80,000 in 1961. In 1949 the Arabs cultivated 85,000 acres; in 1961 they tilled 220,000. There were 681 tractors in the country in 1948 and no less than 7,835 in 1961.

Before the establishment of the state, our industry was concentrated in the narrow coastal strip between Rehovot in the south and Haifa in the north, and was devoted mainly to industries producing for home consumption, such as food, textiles, wood-working, paper and printing; in fact, it was chiefly concerned with the final processing of materials for the local market. During the 15 years of the state, our industry has been comprehensively reorganized. Our output, employment, and exports have grown. New branches have been established: metalworking, chemicals, petrochemical manufactures, electronics, arms manufacture, and their secondary branches, and output in other industries has been increased. In September 1955, oil was first discovered in Israel, in southern Judea, at a depth of 4,905 feet, and in 1957 a rich source of natural gas was found at Zohar, near the Dead Sea. Extensive deposits of phosphates have been discovered in the Negev, and copper mines at Timna, not far from Eilat. After the Sinal campaign, an oil pipeline was laid from Eilat to the refineries which the British left in Haifa.

By the end of 1962 there were 14,500 enterprises in the country, employing almost 200,000 workers, as against 88,000 in 1950. Between the rise of the state and 1962, some I£1,600 million (at 1955 prices) were invested in industry; in 1962 alone I£263 million were

invested, as compared with I£85 million in 1959. Industrial output totaled I£500 million in 1962, compared with I£3.5 million, at the same prices, in 1949—an increase of 14 percent per year. Industry had emerged from the narrow limits of the coastal strip, in which it had been confined, expanding northward to Kiryat Shmona and Nahariya, and southward to Kiryat Gat, Ashkelon, Dimona, Mitzpeh Ramon, and Eilat. Industrial exports grew twenty-five fold—from \$10.5 million in 1949 to \$250 million in 1962-63.

Israel has not yet succeeded, however, in balancing her foreign trade. In 1949, with exports at \$28.5 million and imports of \$253.2 million, exports were 11 percent of imports. In 1962, the percentage was 46 percent—with \$282 million exports and \$616 million imports. In absolute terms, therefore, the deficit has increased, but exports per capita grew from \$27 in 1949 to \$212 in 1962, while the trade deficit per capita fell from \$213 to \$144.

Productivity of labor in Israel is steadily on the increase, although in most industries it is still lower than that of the most advanced countries in Europe; in others, however, it is approaching American standards of productivity.

Israel's economic and cultural progress is due to three things: the pioneering spirit that inspires the best of our immigrant and Israeli youth, who respond to the challenge of our desolate areas and the ingathering of the exiles; the feeling of Diaspora Jewry that they are partners in the enterprise of Israel's resurgence in the ancient homeland of the Jewish people; and the power of science and technology, which Israel unceasingly—and not without success—tries to enhance.

Israel is aware that she cannot equal other nations in military force, wealth, numbers or material resources, but she believes that there is no impediment to equality with the greatest nations in the world in intellectual capacity and moral standards—the only heritage bequeathed to her by Jewish history, which is imbued with suffering and spiritual valor.

By virtue of the pioneering energies of three generations, Israel is creating new ways of life in agricultural settlement, in cooperative transport on land and sea, and in a considerable part of her industry which is founded on labor partnership and mutual aid. Thus there have been created the hundreds of kibbutzim, smallholders' settlements and cooperatives in urban and interurban transport, shipping and basic industries. The medical services of the Histadrut, the General Federation of Labor, encompass some three-quarters of the nation. The Israel defense forces are dedicated not only to defense against the external enemy, but also to the molding of the human beings assembled from all over the globe into a single national and cultural entity, the welding of the fragments of the nation and its dispersed tribes with bonds of language, culture, and labor, with an understanding of our people's past and its vision for the future. For this purpose a special formation called Nahal (the Hebrew initials of No'ar Halutz Lohem—Fighting Pioneer Youth) was founded, which has already established 29 kibbutzim and 4 smallholders' villages in the Negev and northern Galilee, most of them border settlements.

The army strives to fructify the desert in both the natural and the human landscape of our country. This is also the central task of the labor federation, which is unique in its organizational structure and methods. It is not only a trade union organization, a cooperative body and an educational institution, but also a league of builders of the homeland and the nation, makers of a new society founded on cooperation and brotherhood.

gured the peace of the world. The action undertaken against this threat carried its own dangers. But as President Kennedy said on October 22, "the greatest danger of all would be to do nothing."

The course on which he then embarked was successful in securing the removal of offensive weapons from Cuba. This success was due, in the first instance, to the ability and will of this country to enforce the quarantine and to the mobilization of allies and others throughout the world in our support.

The confrontation was not in the courtroom and, in a world destructible by man, a legal position was obviously not the sole ingredient of effective action. We were armed, necessarily, with something more substantial than a lawyer's brief. But though it would not have been enough merely to have the law on our side, it is not irrelevant which side the law was on. The effective deployment of force, the appeal for world support, to say nothing of the ultimate judgment of history, all depend in significant degree on the reality and coherence of the case in law for our action. It is worthwhile, I think, to set out that legal case and to examine some of its implications.

II

The blunt fact of the quarantine is that it involved the use of naval force to interfere with shipping on the high seas, though, to be sure, the carriage of offensive weapons, against which it was directed, was something other than ordinary maritime commerce. Historically, the United States, as a great maritime power, has resisted interference with the freedom of the seas. In 1793, when France and England, struggling for the mastery of Europe, seized and blockaded U.S. shipping, Jefferson wrote:

"Those who choose to live in peace retain their natural right . . . to carry the produce of their industry, for exchange, to all nations, belligerent or neutral, as usual; to go and come freely, without injury or molestation; and, in short, that the war among others shall be, for them, as if it did not exist."

A few years later, British blockades, in defiance of our bitter protests, were one of the causes of the War of 1812, although Britain went far beyond mere blockading. Her warships often stopped American vessels on the high seas, declared without proof that certain crewmen were British deserters, and carried them off in irons. During the undeclared war against France, Joseph Story, then a Harvard student but later to become a Supreme Court Justice and one of our great admiralty lawyers, wrote with perhaps more ardor than poetry:

"Shall Gallia's clan our coast invade,
With hellish outrage scourge the main,
Insult our nation's neutral trade,
And we not dare our rights maintain?"

Less hoary examples could be cited.

When our own wartime necessities were involved, however, we took a different view of the matter. In the Civil War, over strident British objections, President Lincoln declared a blockade of 3,000 miles of southern coastline and sought to prevent any contraband from reaching Confederate hands. On the outbreak of World War II, the same 21 American nations that now make up the Organization of American States, meeting in the first Pan American ministerial conference, identified a zone in the high seas ranging from 300 to 1,200 miles wide which they said was of "primary concern and direct utility in their relations." They declared their right to patrol the zone and keep it free from "the commission of any hostile act by any non-American belligerent nation."

The thrust and counterthrust of 19th-century practice was codified with somewhat illusory precision in the Declarations of

Paris in 1856 and London in 1909, dealing with the law of blockade and contraband. As a result, the legal textbooks have a satisfyingly categorical ring. They tell us that a blockade must be declared through competent authority, must be limited to enemy coasts and ports, and must be impartially applied. Most important, the blockade must be effective: the blockading country must have and use the power to enforce it. Similarly, traditional rules of contraband require a proclamation, after which neutral ships can be prevented from aiding the enemy by carrying objectionable goods, a category which, if not overly precise, surely includes weapons.

The rules were designed to minimize disruption of neutral commerce, primarily by limiting the scope of sanctioned interference and by notifying ships and sailors so that they could stay out of harm's way. Mutatis mutandis these aspects of the classical rules were complied with, to like purpose and effect, in the Cuban quarantine.

But there was a further overriding limitation in the traditional rules: they were part of the Law of War which says that only a belligerent in wartime can invoke the right to blockade or search for contraband. Unless nations were at war, there could be no justification for any interference at all with ordinary maritime commerce. Thus some have maintained that everything done in the October crisis would have been legal if only the United States had declared war on Cuba. This may be attractive as a syllogism, but it doesn't have very much to do with law.

The rules of blockade and contraband evolved, like most law, out of the interaction between moral precept, experience, and changing practical necessity. And they reflect rather accurately the shape of the international system—as well as the weapons technology—that prevailed in the last century. Relations between nations were episodic and largely bilateral. When force was applied, it was—at least in theory—a bilateral affair, or at most something between small and temporary groupings of nations on each side. The age of total war was only beginning and there was no general stricture in international law against the use of force as an instrument of state policy.

Resort to force was common enough, however, and was always dangerous enough to provoke rudimentary efforts at regulation. Thus evolved the law of war, a separate legal regime establishing—probably with a good deal more precision and coherence in retrospect than at the time—the rights and obligations of belligerents and neutrals. The declaration of war invoked this special regime. Its legal signification was that the declaring state was prepared to accept its obligations and claim its rights under the law of war. Thereupon, application of force within those confines was legitimate.

III

International law addresses different problems today and there is different legal machinery to deal with them. The overriding object of international law is not to regulate the conduct of war, but to keep and defend the peace. It is no longer possible for any nation to treat war, in Jefferson's words, "as if it did not exist." If nonalignment continues to be a goal for some countries, noninvolvement has become a luxury beyond price. A threat to the peace of any nation is a threat to the peace of all nations, and maintenance of peace has therefore become a collective responsibility. The first quarantining speech, President Franklin Roosevelt's call to "protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease," marked an early recognition of this collective responsibility.

The enduring monument of World War II is the United Nations Charter. It records the judgment of all nations that interna-

tional law can no longer regard the use of force with benevolent neutrality. In article 2 of the charter, members pledge that they will "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

States living under the regime of that charter can no longer find justification for the use of force in their mere unilateral declaration.

Declarations against war had been known before, but the charter records also the judgment that, if these declarations are to be more than empty promises, collective machinery and processes of enforcement are needed. The United Nations Organization was the primary instrument designed for preserving the peace. Regional organizations, like the OAS, arose to perform the same functions within the area of their competence. These organizations are clothed by their charters with the authority to act collectively against aggression and threats to the peace. Through these collective agencies, worldwide or more restricted in scope, we have hoped to give reality to the pledge to maintain the peace.

The Soviet threat in Cuba was made and answered in the context of this international system. The U.S. response must be judged and justified within that same context. It is wrong, therefore, to view the Cuban crisis as though it were a 19th-century contest between two nations, the United States and Cuba, to be regulated by the traditional rules of blockade and contraband. And it is wrong to view the quarantine as a unilateral use of force by the United States in the course of such a contest.

IV

The charter obligation to refrain from the use of force is not absolute. Article 51, of course, affirms that nothing in the charter impairs "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense." The quarantine was defensive in character and was directed against a threat to the peace. But neither the President in his speech nor the OAS in its resolution invoked article 51.

Obviously, the United Nations itself can sanction the use of force to deal with a threat to the peace. So it did in Korea and in the Congo. But no United Nations organ ordered the quarantine of Cuba.

The quarantine action falls within a third category: action by regional organizations to preserve the peace. The charter assigns an important role to regional organizations in carrying out the purposes of the U.N. article 52(1) prescribes the use of "regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of national peace and security as are appropriate for regional action" Regional organizations are referred to throughout the charter, and all of chapter VIII is devoted to their peace-keeping functions. These provisions were written into the charter with the Inter-American system specifically in mind. Alberto Lleras Camargo, later to be President of Colombia, was chief protagonist in early 1945 of the Act of Chapultepec, which foreshadowed the Rio Treaty, and was head of the committee at San Francisco which dealt with regional organizations a few months later.

The charter reflects the judgment of the world community that collective action is to be preferred to the unrestricted use of force by individual nations. Why? First, members of an organization, in signing its charter, have assented to its powers and procedures. Second, decisions are made by political processes involving checks and balances and giving assurance that the outcome will reflect considered judgment and broad consensus. These principles can be seen in operation of the Inter-American system.

May 2

The assent of the parties to the Rio Treaty is real and significant. Though the present Government of Cuba is now and has been for some time the object of sanctions by the OAS, and has been suspended from participation in its agencies, Cuba as a state has remained a party to the treaties and a member of the Inter-American system, as, in a like case, did the Dominican Republic. The political processes in the Organization of American States are also real. It is not a rubber stamp, despite the disproportion of power between the United States and its neighbors to the south. Not until the danger was clear and present was the necessary majority mustered for the use of force. But when that time came, the vote was unanimous.

The quarantine action was authorized under the Rio Treaty of 1947, whose primary purpose was to organize law-abiding states for collective action against threats to the peace. This treaty, together with related agreements, forms the legal framework of the Inter-American system.

The treaty provides for collective action not only in the case of armed attack but also "if the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected . . . by any . . . fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America . . ." In such cases, a special body, the Organ of Consultation, is to "meet immediately in order to agree on the measures . . . which must be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent." The Organ of Consultation acts only by a two-thirds vote. The treaty is explicit as to the measures which may be taken "for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent." The "use of armed force" is specifically authorized, though "no state shall be required to use armed force without its consent."

On October 23, the Organ of Consultation met, in accordance with the treaty procedures, and considered the evidence of the secret introduction of Soviet strategic nuclear missiles into Cuba. It found that a situation existed which endangered the peace of America. It recommended that member states "take all measures, individually and collectively, including the use of armed force, which they may deem necessary to insure that the Government of Cuba cannot continue to receive from the Sino-Soviet powers military material and related supplies. . . ." The quarantine was imposed in accordance with this recommendation. Indeed, the operative language of the OAS resolution is recited in the President's proclamation, "Interdicting the Carriage of Offensive Weapons to Cuba."

Some have asked whether we should not first have gone to the United Nations Security Council, before taking other action to meet the Soviet threat in Cuba. Perhaps in the original conception at San Francisco it was intended that the Security Council would be the agency for dealing with situations of this kind unless it chose to delegate its responsibility. This much may be implicit in article 53, which states: "No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council." The drafters of the charter demonstrated their wisdom, however, by making Security Council responsibility for dealing with threats to the peace primary and not exclusive. Events since 1945 have

demonstrated that the Council, like our own electoral college, was not a wholly viable institution. The veto has largely disabled it from fulfilling its intended role in keeping the peace.

This paralysis of the Security Council has led to a reliance on alternative peacekeeping institutions. In the United Nations itself, the General Assembly and the Secretary General have stepped into the gap. Less dramatically, so has the OAS, pursuant to the provisions of chapter VIII of the charter on "Regional Arrangements."

A technical part of this evolution, if a quiet one, has been the construction of article 53 so as to limit its scope. Security Council discussion of sanctions imposed by the OAS against the Dominican Republic and Cuba, as well as the opinion of the International Court of Justice in the United Nations assessment case, have treated enforcement action as a rigorously narrow category. Perhaps more important, the debates in the Security Council in the case of the Dominican Republic revealed a widespread readiness to conclude that the requirement of authorization does not import prior approval, but would be satisfied by subsequent action of the Council, or even by a mere taking note of the acts of the regional organization. In this context, it is important that the Security Council met in emergency session before the quarantine of Cuba went into effect. The Soviet Union introduced a resolution of disapproval, but by general consent it was not brought to a vote.

This narrowing process of interpretation may be resisted by those who seek the comforting certainty of plain meaning in words—forgetting that they are, in Holmes' phrase, the skin of living thought. But surely it is no more surprising to say that failure of the Security Council to disapprove regional action amounts to authorization within the meaning of article 53 than it was to say that the abstention and even the absence of a permanent member of the Security Council met the requirement of article 27(3) for "the concurring votes of the permanent members. . . ."

This interpretation does no violence to the notion of the United Nations as the paramount organization. Regional organizations continue subordinate to the United Nations by the terms of the charter, and, in the case of the OAS, by the terms of the relevant inter-American treaties themselves. Like an individual state, the OAS can be called to account for its action in an appropriate agency of the more encompassing organization. In recognition of this relationship, the President ordered that the Cuban case be put immediately before the Security Council. The United Nations, through the Council and the Secretary General, became actively involved in the effort to develop a permanent solution to the threat to the peace represented by the Soviet nuclear capability in Cuba.

Since World War II, each of the actions to keep the peace—in Korea, in the Middle East, in Lebanon, in the Congo, and now in Cuba—has taken a different operational form. But each of them reflects our conviction that a breach of the peace involves us all and that we must meet it together, through institutions of collective security established for that purpose.

The quarantine, seen in this framework, is a significant addition to the developing body of postwar experience with collective responsibility and collective action to preserve the peace.

Gen. Thomas E. Moore, Commander of Sheppard Air Force Base, is Transferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, announcement was made this week of the departure from Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., of Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, who has been commander there for almost 4 years.

During this period of outstanding service, General Moore has endeared himself to the city of Wichita Falls, Tex., and all the citizens of the area around Sheppard Air Force Base.

Under General Moore's leadership, Sheppard has undergone tremendous change and expansion. Today this Air Force installation stands out as one of the most important in the Nation. It is slated to be space training headquarters for the Air Force. Outstanding facilities, including a new regional Air Force hospital now under construction, have been added under General Moore's leadership.

Even more important, perhaps, there now exists a relationship between the civilian and military community which is unexcelled anywhere. The feeling of harmony and unity of purpose, which has gained national publicity, is largely due to the continuing and dedicated efforts of General Moore and community leaders.

General Moore and his lovely wife will long be remembered in north Texas as dear friends and wonderful citizens. The community, Sheppard Air Force Base, and the Air Force will long remember with pride the service General Moore has rendered.

Following are two articles from the Wichita Falls Times. One, an editorial which appeared on April 30 titled "SAFB Transformed Under General Moore." The other an article announcing his pending departure which appeared in the Times on April 29.

[From the Wichita Falls, (Tex.) Times, Apr. 30, 1963]

SAFB TRANSFORMED UNDER GENERAL MOORE
Wichita Falls and Sheppard Air Force Base will prepare for the departure of Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, who will be leaving after almost four busy years as the commanding general of SAFB, with full appreciation for the unexcelled job he has done.

Since General Moore assumed command of the base August 1, 1959, it has undergone a transformation in mission and in physical assets that has had no equal dating back to the time it was first populated only a few weeks before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, brought the United States into World War II in 1941.

Chief among the changes in mission which have been accomplished as SAFB during the

1963

GOVERNOR RHODES IS SHAKING THINGS UP
(By Haskell Short)

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—Gov. James A. Rhodes, to use one of his favorite expressions, is "shaking things up" in national political circles by practicing the economy he believes politicians forget when they take office.

Ohio's new Republican Governor showed he meant business when he fired about 3,500 recently employed State employees his first day in office. By June 30, about 7,000, or most of those added to the payrolls in the past year, will be gone.

Among Rhodes' other shaking-them-up tactics are a 9.1 percent across-the-board cut in welfare spending, a balanced budget without new taxes, a planned reorganization of State government, and an ambitious program to get new industry for the State.

As Governor of a big State, Rhodes almost automatically becomes a major figure in next year's jockeying for the Republican presidential nomination—at least as top man in an important delegation to the Republican National Convention.

TALKS ABOUT PROBLEMS

In his austere office, which seems more like an echo chamber, he spoke of the problems and programs he sees for Ohio.

"Somewhere, sometime government must learn to live within its income," the 53-year-old Governor said. "It must learn that deficit spending does not provide jobs for the people. It must learn to allow people to do some things for themselves instead of taking their tax money and trying to do everything for them."

Rhodes said he found State finances "in a mess" when he became Governor January 14. A firm of certified accountants reported the State had an \$80 million deficit, that many bills were unpaid, that 7,500 employees had been added within the past year, and that spending was about \$5 million a month more than revenues.

"That meant that to keep spending at the current level and pay the debt we would need \$200 million in new taxes in the 2 years beginning July 1," Rhodes said.

"I do not believe we needed new taxes which already are burdensome enough, so we had to cut spending and stop the drifting that was all too obvious in State government."

WANTS EXPENSES CUT

He told Finance Director Richard L. Krabach, who wears a miniature gold hatchet with a bloodstained blade as a tie clasp, to cut expenses and balance the budget.

Krabach ordered a 9.1-percent slash in spending. He scrapped budget requests totalling about \$100 million left by the DiSalle administration.

Welfare payments were cut, most of them to what they were last October 1 when former Gov. Michael V. DiSalle raised them a month before election. Rhodes said the cut would force counties which run the program to improve their operations.

The Governor then gave the legislature an appropriations bill calling for \$1.282 billion in the 2 years beginning July 1. It was \$53 million above current spending, with 90 percent of the money earmarked for education, mental hygiene, and welfare programs. Highway programs are financed out of the gasoline tax and were not included in the budget.

Rhodes' top objective and No. 1 campaign plank was industrial development to get the State's economy moving. Ohio leads the country in the number of persons on relief and has fewer people productively employed than in 1957 although the population has increased.

HELPS INDUSTRY

He is creating an industrial development authority which will issue bonds to help finance plant construction. It also is telling the country about Ohio's resources and po-

tential from offices being opened in major cities around the country.

Rhodes will not discuss the future, but his friends suggest that in 1968, when he will be in the middle of his second term and ineligible under the State constitution to seek reelection, he could be an impressive national figure.

But Rhodes, sitting there in a short-sleeve shirt in the big bare office, brushes off talk of presidential politics as easily and bluntly as he dismisses spending proposals.

"I spent 25 years getting here," Rhodes said. "I wanted to be Governor and that is the opportunity the people gave me. I want to do the best job I can in this office and that will take all of my time."

SURVEY SHOWS STRONG DESIRE
FOR ACTION IN CUBA

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. MACGREGOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

	Yes	No	No opinion
Should the United States do whatever is necessary (even to the point of military action) to assure a non-Communist government in Cuba?	4,840	580	479
Should income taxes be cut if Federal spending is not cut?	1,025	4,608	258
The new budget calls for about \$5,000,000,000 for foreign aid. Do you approve?	656	4,896	340
The President proposes \$5,300,000,000 (over 5 years) in new Federal spending for schools (including teacher salaries). Do you approve?	1,940	3,682	264
Should secret-ballot approval by union members be required before a union can call a strike?	5,423	235	228
The President proposed a 5,000-member corps (known as the Domestic Peace Corps) to work in community social problems. Estimated annual cost, \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000. Do you approve?	1,057	4,449	385
Do you favor compulsory acre-and-bushel control of farm production (similar to that in the upcoming wheat referendum)?	1,076	4,351	468

Mailing of the questionnaires is not complete, and a final report will probably be made about June 1.

MAY 3: FREE POLAND'S NATIONAL
HOLIDAY

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MACGREGOR) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, May 3 represents the 172d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. This historic document symbolizes the spirit and hopes of the Polish people. All over the United States, in Cleveland, and New York, in every town and hamlet, wherever Americans of Polish descent reside, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the courageous people of Poland. It is also an excellent reminder lest we become to complacent about our own freedom.

But the year 1963 is of even greater significance because 100 years ago occurred the Polish January uprising. There have been many Polish uprisings against Russian tyranny, both before and since 1863. However, this one was the longest and bloodiest in history. During the night of January 22, 1863, units of Polish insurgents attacked Russian garrisons in many localities and captured considerable amounts of arms and ammunition. However, 350,000 seasoned troops of the regular Russian

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, most west central Illinois citizens want the United States to do whatever is necessary, even to the point of military action, to assure a non-Communist government in Cuba, according to the first tally in my annual survey of home district opinion. My staff is mailing questionnaires to names selected at random from telephone directories, and the first tally covers 5,899 replies.

Those expressing an opinion were 8 to 1 for action on Communist Cuba.

By about 4 to 1, they oppose \$5 billion for foreign aid, the Domestic Peace Corps, compulsory acre-bushel control of farming, and cutting income taxes if spending is not cut.

By 22 to 1, they would require secret ballot approval by union members before a union can call a strike.

By 2 to 1, they oppose the \$5.3 billion 5-year proposal for general school aid.

Here is the tally:

Army were rushed in and crushed the Polish insurgents. In our own lifetime we have witnessed similar Communist brutality, not only in Poland, but also in Hungary and East Germany.

Poland, whose history dates from 966, was once a free nation and we can be confident that a free nation in Poland will be born again. It is an honor and a privilege for me to join my colleagues in this occasion to salute the Polish people and pay tribute to the spirit of the May 3 constitution.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. MACGREGOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that sadness and frustration must mark another observance of a great event in mankind's quest for freedom—the adoption of Poland's Constitution on May 3, 1791.

Elation should accompany this occasion. But any suggestion of joy is cruelly overshadowed by the grim fact that for 172 years an heroic, enlightened people have been forced to witness brutal rejection of their right of self-government.

Through the years the Polish people have suffered unbelievable tortures and setbacks, fighting in vain against the overwhelming odds of aggressive tyranny. What they have wanted—what they fought and died for—was not power

May 2

reaching across the borders of neighbors, not fulfillment of dreams of grandeur. What they wanted was merely finalization of an assertion of democracy as expressed in the words of a constitution barely 2 years after our own.

It said:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. Speaker, these are the Poles. These are the patriots we salute today. These are the millions who are enslaved by Communist Russia. These are the warriors of liberty who lost 250,000 of their sons 100 years ago when they resisted another form of Russian tyranny, these are the people who resisted the Nazi occupation in 1944. That spirit of resistance is alive today, and in its fire there is a prophecy of hope for the future. The Poles will not be denied, and it is up to their friends in the free world to see that they are not.

In the United States, Poles are wrapped up in our destiny. We are the adopted homeland of 7 million of them. We are the beneficiaries of their fighting spirit beginning with Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who volunteered their services when America fought for its independence. In World War I and World War II countless thousands served with our Armed Forces.

We are indebted to Polish-Americans for contributing to the growth and development of the United States. We owe them our gratitude as loyal American citizens.

So today we say to them, we remember 1791; remember it with reverence and a determination to do whatever we can to make sure future years will find them prospering as a partner in the free world, not suffering as captives of atheistic communism.

WOOL NUMBERS GAME—WHO'S NEXT?

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. MacGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday of this week, I commented here on the shutdown of the Dartmouth Woolen Mills, Inc., in Claremont, N.H.

Now comes news of the closing of the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co. in Stafford Springs, Conn., another forward step toward the New Frontier.

Mr. Speaker, throughout New England, thousands of workers and countless communities are wondering, who will be next? How many jobs will be lost in New England's wool industry next week?

President Kennedy has promised action to aid the wool industry; he has been promising for 2 long years. The crisis deepens, but no help comes.

All wool asks is the same treatment which was given cotton in 1961. All wool asks is equal treatment and fairplay.

New England woolworkers do not want handouts. All they want is their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I have today received from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers the following grim account of what the administration's broken promises have done, so far, to the wool industry:

THE GRIM STORY OF GOVERNMENT INACTION, RISING IMPORTS, AND 13 WOOL TEXTILE MILL LIQUIDATIONS

The commitment: White House letter of August 7, 1962, to NAWM:

"Limitation of textile imports to prevent market disruption is an essential element of administration policy. We intend to implement this policy with regard to all textiles, and particularly to prevent market disruption such as would result from an increase over current levels of imports."

No action has been taken, however, and 1962 wool product imports reached a record high. The influx in 1963 exceeds that in the same 1962 period. Mill closings reported in the press since August 7, 1962, total 13, as follows:

YEAR 1962

October: Charlottesville Woolen Mills, Charlottesville, Va.; woolen cloth.

November: Grosvendale Woolen Mills, North Grosvendale, Conn.; woolen cloth.

December: Bonin Spinning Co., Woonsocket, R.I.; woolen yarn.

French-American-British Woolens, Newburgh, N.Y.; woolen cloth.

YEAR 1963

January: Mapleville plant, Stillwater Worsted Mills, Mapleville, R.I.; worsted cloth.

Yale Woolen Mills, Yale, Mich.; woolen cloth.

February: Jonathan Ring & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; woolen yarn.

Yorkshire Worsted Mills, Lenni, Pa.; worsted cloth.

Northfield Mills, Northfield, Vt.; woolen cloth.

March: Shamokin Woolen Mills, Shamokin, Pa.; wool cloth.

Mariand plant, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Andover, Mass.; woolen cloth.

Samuel Hird & Co., Clifton, N.J.; wool tops.

April: Cyril Johnson Woolen Co., Stafford Springs, Conn.; woolen cloth.

NEWS RELEASE CONCERNING FLIGHT OF WOOLEN INDUSTRY, APRIL 26, 1963

Mr. Ronald A. Mitchell, president of the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co., announced today the closing of the Stafford Springs, Conn., plant in its 75th continuous year of operation.

His announcement to the employees reads as follows:

"It is with great regret that we, today, announce the closing of the Cyril Johnson Woolen Co. Orders for our customers and commitments for fabric for our Government's military requirements will be completed during the next few months and then operations will be discontinued. The many improvements that we have made have still been insufficient to reverse the long downward trend of this company.

"The Cyril Johnson organization with its 250 employees has taken action in all phases of its business to improve its position and reverse the trend but without success.

"It looked for some action by our Government to control the imports of woolen fabrics and garments. Nothing has been done, and there seems to be little hope that effective

action will be taken. In the meantime, the tremendous and uncontrolled increase in imports from low-wage countries has disrupted the markets for the high-quality fabrics produced by Cyril Johnson.

"The closing of this fine quality American mill is a great misfortune for its people and this community.

"We hope the administration will take some positive and prompt action to control imports within reasonable limits so that these liquidations will not continue."

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. MacGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems and costs of our present highway program is the acquisition of the necessary rights-of-way. It was estimated in 1960 that the cost of the necessary real property to complete the Interstate System would be approximately \$4.6 billion, or nearly 15 percent of the total remaining cost of the Interstate System. In addition to the matter of cost, other aspects of right-of-way acquisition have proved troublesome. Because of inconvenience and hardships of persons and businesses displaced by highway construction, Congress enacted as a part of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, a provision providing for relocation advisory assistance and the payment of moving costs. Because of many questions as to the adequacy of the existing laws and regulations under which real property is acquired for all the various Federal and federally assisted programs, the Public Works Committee in 1961 created a Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition to exhaustively research and analyze all existing laws and regulations and submit appropriate recommendations. The work of the select subcommittee is expected to be completed next year.

Regardless of what recommendations may be submitted by the select subcommittee, one fact is obvious: Costs can be greatly reduced and many other problems alleviated, if not entirely eliminated, by acquiring highway rights-of-way well in advance of actual construction. People living in the shadow of approaching highways have the right to know just what land the State is going to buy and to get their compensation as soon as possible so they can plan for the future.

The cost of property is constantly increasing. In addition, property which is vacant today may be improved with apartment buildings, supermarkets, or other expensive developments by the time the State highway departments are ready to proceed with highway construction. In order to conserve Federal and State funds to the greatest degree possible, it is essential that the States be enabled to acquire property needed for rights-of-way at an early time when it can be purchased at a comparatively low cost, rather than being forced to wait until the property has increased drastically in value.

The Congress recognized this at the time it enacted the Federal Aid Highway

dealing with the \$73 million Philippine claims deal.

Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas what his attitude may be toward the solution of this deal?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I say to my distinguished friend from Iowa what we are seeking to do now is to appoint conferees, and I have no idea that the House conferees will be able to digest what the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol have done before Monday morning. I want to assemble with my friends. Frankly, I do not know what is in the bill, but I have been told that the basic philosophy as to what our friends at the other end of the Capitol did is totally opposed to the philosophy of the House when the bill left this body.

Mr. Speaker, I see our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], is present, and I would say if a little guessing is in order, I imagine the House conferees will certainly have a leaning to go along with the original philosophy as expressed in the House bill.

Mr. GROSS. Now, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that there has been a good deal of publicity relating to the charges, the allegations—call them what you will—of some form of payola, attending the passage of the legislation last year. I would like to see a real discussion of this bill on the floor of the House. I would like to have some understanding, if it is possible to have it with the gentleman, that some Members who opposed this bill originally, and others, perhaps, if they care to do so, will have some time in which to express their opinion as to the results of the conference when this matter is reported back to the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly we will.

Mr. GROSS. The time is going to be under the control of the gentleman from Texas, but there is one way of getting 30 minutes for the minority for a discussion and that is by an objection now which would send it to the Committee on Rules. I do not want to object if I can be assured that when the conference report comes to the House there will be time for some of us who would like to do so to express our opinions on what has been done.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my friend that a little guessing is in order but I doubt that there will be the slightest difference of opinion on the question of fees; and as far as time is concerned we make a commitment now that our friend from Iowa will have time to express his views.

Mr. GROSS. I am not speaking for myself alone; I am speaking for others who may be interested. I would dislike very much to agree to the unanimous consent request made by the gentleman now, and then see others precluded within reasonable time limitations, from speaking on this subject. I think the \$73 million payment to the Philippine was ill advised from the start. I think deception has been practiced upon the Congress, upon those who supported the bill as well as those who opposed it, and particularly those who opposed it. I

want to see this forced out into the open. I want to see it discussed on the House floor. I want to see as much as possible of the full hour on the conference report used to tell us the story of what has transpired with respect to this mess.

Mr. THOMAS. I think we can assure the gentleman that ample time will be available to discuss this matter in its entirety; I assure the gentleman of that now.

Mr. GROSS. We are running into altogether too many allegations of payola with respect to the operations of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. I can assure the gentleman now there will be some limitation on that point in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, KIRWAN, CANNON, Bow, and WILSON of Indiana.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

MAY 2, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby advise you of my resignation from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT G. BURKHALTER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], I offer a resolution (H. Res. 332) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: EVERETT G. BURKHALTER, of California.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: EDWARD R. ROYBAL, of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit today while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr.

MILLS], who advises me that he has cleared this matter with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Monday to file a report, including minority and supplemental views, on the bill H.R. 6009, to provide for the period ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight tonight to file reports on the following bills: H.R. 101, H.R. 40, and H.R. 3742.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight May 4 to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIFIC PLAN FOR OAS ACTION AGAINST CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the past few weeks have shown that the Organization of American States can be highly effective. A special OAS committee headed by Ambassador deLavalle, of Peru, is now completing its recommendations for OAS action against Communist Cuba, and with remarkable speed the OAS dispatched an investigation of the current turmoil in Haiti.

Use of this effective Organization is our most immediate recourse in the Cuban problem short of a direct confrontation with Soviet Russia. We cannot continue at the present rate of inaction. "Peaceful coexistence" with Castro simply means piecemeal takeover in Latin America through Communist salami tactics.

For this reason, U.S. leadership in the OAS must be increased to the same pitch it reached last autumn when we won the entire support of Latin America during the October missile crisis. We can win that support again with the same firm spirit.

I, therefore, urge again that the United States propose the following five-

gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton], in expressing our deep sorrow at the death of Jessica Weis. It is hard for me to realize that Judy has passed on.

I think of her as a lively, fun-loving, bright, attractive person. She had wit and charm, but most of all a supreme dedication to public service and the people that she represented.

The 36th district of New York is most fortunate in the unusually high caliber of Representatives it has had. Since World War II there has been our colleague in the Senate, Kenneth B. Keating, then Jessica Weis, and now Frank Horton. All have lent strength and luster to the district and given great representation to the people of their district.

In Judy we have lost a person who gave standards to her party, loyalty to her friends, and devotion to the free enterprise system. She well understood the energy and effort that is required to keep democracy and freedom alive, and she applied her energies accordingly.

Judy will be missed. Most of all she will be missed by her wonderful family. To my friend and classmate, and Judy's son, Charles M. Weis, and his two sisters, Mrs. Lindsay and I extend our deepest sympathy. I am sure they will be comforted in the realization of the contribution their mother made to America's well-being.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of sorrow that I learned of the passing of Judy Weis, my dear friend and former colleague.

It was a genuine pleasure to serve with her here in the House, and Mrs. Riehlman and I treasured her friendship. Last year when Mrs. Weis announced her retirement from Congress because of ill health, all of us who worked with her were saddened. I worked with her on both the Government Operations and the Science and Astronautics Committees and can testify to her significant contributions.

She was a devoted and conscientious servant of the people and gracious to all who knew her. She was a fine lady in every sense of the word and an outspoken advocate of women's role in Government and politics.

Mrs. Weis spent many years of her life working for the high ideals in which she believed, and her service will not be forgotten.

My deepest sympathy goes out to her family in their bereavement.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the death of my friend of longest standing in the U.S. Congress, the Honorable Jessica McCullough Weis.

Judy was a dear friend, one for whom I had the greatest admiration. The Nation's loss probably can best be stated by others, but my personal loss is very great indeed. Our acquaintance and friendship began back in 1948, and in all of the years that I have known Judy, she has put forth her finest efforts to make this Nation a better place in which to live.

To those of us who have had the honor and privilege of knowing her and working with her over the years, Judy will be sorely missed—and never replaced.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I mourn today the tragic loss to this Nation that occurred yesterday when a distinguished former colleague and friend of mine died at the much too early age of 62. I refer to the passing of Jessica McCullough Weis, who served two distinguished terms in this House and who at all times was generous to me and to my colleagues. She added to this House the charm that was hers in great measure.

The charm that she possessed did not in anyway prevent her from being an outstanding public servant. This charm did not prevent her from seeking the active life. In fact, she decided early to make her influence felt in our national life. It would have been easy for her to simply watch the passing parade. She would not have had to give up countless hours to the political process. But she did, and in living her life, she exemplified the highest ideals of public service.

She will be particularly missed in her adopted State of New York. She will be missed in this Chamber, and she will be missed throughout the land.

To me, she was a dear and devoted friend. I will miss Judy a great deal, and I will never forget her. Her devotion to public life, her enthusiasm and good spirit, made a great impression on all of us. It is good that we pause in memory of this great and good lady.

This morning's edition of the New York Times reviewed Jessica McCullough Weis' career, and I would like to make this part of the body of the Record.

JESSICA McCULLOUGH WEIS DEAD—GOP COMMITTEEWOMAN, 62—TWO-TERM U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM UPSTATE HELD CIVIL DEFENSE ADVISORY POST

ROCHESTER, May 1.—Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis, a two-term U.S. Representative and a Republican national committeewoman, died of cancer this afternoon at her home. She was 62 years old.

Mrs. Weis was elected to the House of Representatives from the 36th District in 1958, succeeding KENNETH B. KEATING, now U.S. Senator. She had served on the House Science and Astronautics Committee. She was reelected in 1960 but did not run last year because of illness.

Surviving are two daughters, Mrs. William C. Warren 3d and Mrs. Cameron Jameson; a son, Charles McCullough Weis, a professor at Ohio Wesleyan University, and six grandchildren.

ENTERED POLITICS IN 1935

Jessica McCullough Weis was a stranger to politics until 1935, long after she began rearing family of a boy and two girls. Her husband, Charles W. Weis, Jr., to whom she was married in 1921 and who died in 1958, was in business and had no political leanings.

In 1935, Thomas E. Broderick, the Monroe County Republican leader, was looking for party workers. He named Mrs. Weis vice chairman of the citizens' Republican finance committee. The taste for politics became a consuming interest and Mrs. Weis led a successful campaign to raise funds for GOP coffers.

The next year she organized motor caravans to boost the candidacy of Gov. Alfred M. Landon, of Kansas, when he ran against Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1936 presidential campaign. The same year she was named an alternate delegate to the Republican State convention.

Through the years, the Chicago-born Mrs. Weis served in various capacities on county committees and later was appointed to the

State executive committee. In 1940 she was a delegate-at-large to the Republican National Convention. In all, she was a delegate-at-large at six national conventions.

The same year she was elected president for a 2-year term of the National Federation of Republican Women's Clubs. Her duties carried her across the Nation, meeting with many of the group's 350,000 members in 38 States.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower appointed Mrs. Weis a member of the National Civil Defense Advisory Council in 1953 and reappointed her 3 years later.

Wearing her "lucky dress," a royal blue wool that she had worn at high spots in her 1958 congressional campaign, Mrs. Weis was sworn in as a Member in the 86th Congress. She was reelected in 1960.

Once asked why she had embarked on her career, she replied:

"I really went into politics because I got tired sitting around the sitting room and objecting to the way things were being run. I decided I ought to do something about it or stop objecting."

While in the House, Mrs. Weis conducted a personal poll to help select a national flower. She reported that the rose won by a count of 6 to 1. The rose is the New York State flower.

Active in Rochester civic affairs, she served on the women's board of the Genesee Hospital and the board of the Rochester Convalescent Hospital for Children. Mrs. Weis was a member of the Rochester Business and Professional Women's Club and founder and president of the Chatterbox Club there. She also was the author of "Politics—U. S. A."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of Mrs. Jessica McCullough Weis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1963, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—as I understand it this appropriation bill contains a legislative rider put on by the other body

point plan to the OAS Council for adoption by the nations of the hemisphere: First. Curb movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout the hemisphere.

Second. Freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American banking institutions.

Third. Close the seaports of the hemisphere to nations engaged in seatriade with Cuba.

Fourth. Close airports of the hemisphere to airlines with flights into Cuba.

Fifth. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

I am today introducing legislation to express the sense of the Congress that the above plan be proposed to the OAS and adopted. The application of these steps will halt communism in this hemisphere.

MEXICO'S "CINCO DE MAYO"

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, May 5 is the anniversary of the day in 1862 when Mexican forces at Puebla beat back French troops in their march to capture Mexico City.

The Battle of Puebla is a chapter in the attempt of Napoleon III to establish an empire in Mexico with Maximilian of Austria on the throne.

The initial excuse for the French intervention was the refusal or inability of Mexico to meet its financial obligations. Mexico had signed a convention with Great Britain in 1842, and later with Spain and France, recognizing its indebtedness and agreeing to set aside a percentage of the customs receipts at Vera Cruz and Tampico for the payment of interest and principal, but as a result of repeated revolutions had defaulted on payments.

In June 1861, the great reformer, Benito Juarez, became President of Mexico. Finding himself financially unable to launch the progressive economic and educational problems he had planned and in need of money to suppress continuing guerrilla fighting, Juarez, in July 1861, suspended for 2 years payment on foreign debts. France, Spain, and England—Mexico's principal creditors—responded in October 1861 with a convention in which they agreed to occupy Mexican ports and collect the customs duties to secure payments of debts. At the same time they forswore any violation of Mexico's territorial integrity or its political autonomy.

Troops of the three European countries landed at Veracruz in early 1862. Dissension among the allies revealed that the French were using the scheme of debt collection as a pretext for imperial conquest. The British and Spanish Governments, convinced of the duplicity of France, ordered the withdrawal of their armed forces from Mexican soil. The United States, although alarmed by the French maneuvers, was reduced by the Civil War to helpless protestations.

The French troops began a march to the Mexican capital, apparently under the impression that the Mexican people would welcome their intervention—a view assiduously cultivated in Paris by defeated Mexican monarchists and clerical supporters. At Puebla on May 5 the French encountered their first resistance by the republican forces of Mexico.

Although the Mexican victory at Puebla was only a temporary setback for the invading French—a reinforced French Army occupied Mexico City on July 10, 1863—Mexicans regard the battle at Puebla with great sentiment. The fact that Mexicans, armed with ancient weapons and inexperienced in modern warfare, could defeat Napoleon III's well-equipped and renowned troops created a surge of national pride in Mexico, served as a unifying force in a nation rent by civil strife, and became a symbol of Mexico's resistance to foreign tyranny.

POLICY DECISIONS

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed when I read Lyle C. Wilson's column, "Who Knew About Castro?" which appeared in the press yesterday. I was impressed because of the manner in which Mr. Wilson raised a question which has been of great concern to me for some time, not simply because of the Cuban situation, but because it fits a pattern.

I remember back in 1960, on the occasion of the U-2 incident, when I spent considerable time and made a conscientious effort to learn the identity of the individual who made the original decision to make the false announcement concerning the nature of the flight on which Powers was forced down. It was most embarrassing and humiliating to me, as one American citizen, to be forced to admit that the United States had been caught in a lie. I did not make the speech that I had written and which I had intended making on the floor of this House, largely because I do not approve of speeches made by persons who are either uninformed, misinformed, or partially informed. But, I did go to Mr. Allen Dulles, then head of the CIA and conveyed to him my views on this matter, telling him that I believed this big lie had done more to destroy the confidence of our friends in many parts of the world than any other one thing which had been done in recent years.

I not only told Mr. Dulles that I believed someone had committed a grievous error, but I felt very strongly that the person who had made this decision, should be removed from any policymaking position in our Government. Mr. Dulles declined, possibly with very good reason, to identify the person who had made this decision, and furthermore declined to say whether the decision had been made by someone in CIA, State,

Department, Department of Defense, or the White House. President Eisenhower accepted the responsibility, just as he accepted the responsibility for backing the Castro government, but in both cases, I think most people would agree that the decisions were made by someone in a much lower echelon. I realize that hindsight is always much more accurate than foresight, but I still contend that those individuals who are responsible for making such tragic errors of judgment, should not be permitted to remain in positions where they can continue to do damage to this Nation.

The recent report of the Comptroller General has pointed up this weakness in our system of government where we continue to keep in positions of responsibility men who are incompetent and have proved this incompetence through decisions which have cost this Government billions of dollars.

Some weeks ago I called to the attention of this House, decisions of the GSA and the Post Office Department, to build federally owned buildings, the cost of which cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination. When I questioned a proposal in a prospectus issued by GSA in December, and pointed out some of the locations where I felt the expenditures could not be justified, they brought out a revised list, which omitted some 50-odd projects, and reduced the proposed expenditure from \$32 million down to \$20 million. An official in the Post Office Department was frank enough to admit that mistakes had been made, and that some of the projects could not be justified. Who made the original decision that they were justified? I have not been able to learn the identity of the person, and I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if you can learn.

Administrations change, but the policy remains the same. The policymakers are not Republicans and they are not Democrats—they are bureaucrats, regardless of which administration is in power. Particularly is this true in the State Department, and you have heard me from time to time speak of the arrogance of some of these in these policymaking positions who have appeared before committees of Congress.

I realize that the President cannot, and even the members of the Cabinet cannot, be familiar with every detail of administration of this Government, but I do say that when errors of judgment are made, and after they have been called to the attention of those who have to accept the responsibility, that some action should be taken to see that these mistakes are not repeated—at least not by the same incompetent individuals.

In closing, I would like to be assured that the individual who cleared Castro in the first place, and the man who made the decision to tell the big lie, is not still in a position where he can do further damage to this country of ours. I do not know that I would be as charitable as Mr. Wilson was in his column of yesterday when he closed with this comment:

This guy is no Communist. Just dumb.

The column to which I have referred reads as follows:

WHO KNEW ABOUT CASTRO?
(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The prevailing humiliation and confusion of the United States invites some smart politician to ask a sharp question and to press for a clean answer. The question would be:

"How did this fellow, Castro, grab Cuba in the first place?"

This question would not launch a witch hunt. Neither would it be asked in a maneuver to tag some witless State Department understrapper as a subversive character with Communist tendencies. But it just might provide some valuable guidance for the future.

Enough is known of the State Department's attitude toward Fidel Castro when his revolution was developing to assure that it was not Communist subversion in the Department that caused the United States to foster Castro's takeover of Cuba on January 1, 1959.

It appears to have been stupidity. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee went through the motions of investigating the State Department and the events within it that led up to the tragedy of Castro's Cuban triumph.

Not much, if anything, came of that investigation, other than many thousands of words. No investigation was needed to establish that U.S. intelligence agencies had Castro's number long before his triumphal entry into Havana. Years before that our agents knew that the Beard was in cahoots with the Communists.

Intelligence reports on Castro's Communist sympathies were submitted in detail to the White House, to the State Department and to the Pentagon. Another question, therefore, arises: Did the President and top officials know of these intelligence reports or were the reports diverted or suppressed?

The answers to that doubletrack question would be interesting. If the reports were submitted and neither the President nor his top aids got them, who did get them? And why were they diverted from the top men? And, if so diverted, by whom?

Those are fair questions. They should have been asked and answered long since. But these questions seem not even to have been asked.

The word here in Washington is that intelligence reports on Castro's Communist affiliations were submitted regularly for the guidance of administration policymakers. All of this, of course, was during the Eisenhower administration.

The word is not so clear as to who actually received these reports. There is evidence, however, that these reports did not reach the top where the decision was made to encourage Castro and then to recognize him on his entry into Havana.

Taxpaying stockholders in the Government of the United States may not believe that such things can happen here. But they do happen. It is reasonable to believe that understrappers in Government cut off the Secretary of State, the President, and perhaps the Secretary of Defense, from information vital to them in judging Castro.

Somebody in Congress should have the gumption to get some simple understandable answers to all of the questions raised by the Castro goof.

If it happened the way it seems to have happened, the guy responsible probably still is in Washington somewhere with a desk, a title and a salary from the taxpayers—ready, willing and able to do it again. This guy is no Communist. Just dumb.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a good many millions of Americans each year celebrate the 3d of May as an anniversary day of freedom. They are the sons and daughters of Americans of Polish ancestry and Polish pride, who are still aware that in a Polish Constitution of 1791 the great doctrines of human freedom and national sovereignty were proclaimed deep in the continent of Europe.

It has been 172 years since Poland's people set forth the constitutional declaration that the purpose of the state must be to serve the will of those it governed, with the civil liberty of the citizens guaranteed.

This was a revolutionary declaration at the time and at the place, and it cut away the outmoded traditions of feudalism. The anniversary is observed by people of Polish ancestry throughout the world as the moment in history when their fatherland moved into the main current of modern concepts of government and society.

We have a special reason this year to spend a few minutes in recognition of the standard of constitutional freedom raised in Poland so many generations ago.

This is the centennial year of a great uprising in Poland against the foreign domination of the Russian czar.

The Polish people had little time after their constitution of 1791 to rebuild their society; the land and the government were taken over in 2 short years in the notorious third partition of the country between Imperial Prussia and Imperial Russia. The bulk of Poland's birthright went to the czar.

The Poles rose again and again in the long course of history against the occupying forces—just as they rose in 1844 when the Warsaw patriots revolted against the Nazi armies. In the 19th century, the greatest uprising was the revolt of 1863.

That year was memorable in history, for us as well as the Poles. It was the year of our Emancipation Proclamation.

In Poland, it meant the rising of the people against foreign garrisons. It meant the capture of arms and the other means of resistance. It meant 2 years of bloody and hard-fought insurgency in the name of freedom before powerful masses of the czar's armies moved in to suppress the rebels and hang the patriots. A quarter of a million sons of Poland were lost in the struggle—slain in pitched battles, executed, or captured and exiled to Siberia.

The spirit that motivated the insurgents of 1863 came from the doctrines embedded in and symbolized by the Constitution of May 3. That same spirit, we may be sure, lives in Poland today and finds its means of expression in many ways. We honor the cause of freedom everywhere by joining in this dual observance here—the anniversary of the

1791 Constitution and the centennial of the uprising of 1863.

SALUTE TO ISRAEL

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that no state in all human history has contributed to mankind in 15 short years anything comparable to the contributions of Israel as an example of democracy, tenacity and vitality.

The Israeli people, on their shelf of land in the cradle of civilization, have lived a life that is more eloquent than any attempt at verbal tribute. They have built a nation that is strong if small in population and area. They have stood as a bulwark of the concept of national sovereignty as well as the doctrines of human freedom. They have welcomed their people returning from the ends of the earth and demonstrated the validity of a good society united by an ideal.

It is a privilege for the rest of us, who share the concepts of our common ancient culture, to salute the State which has built its new foundations well and created a house which all men must gaze at with respect.

AMENDMENTS TO ANTIDUMPING ACT

(Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5692, introduced by Congressman WALTER, proposes many beneficial amendments to the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921. H.R. 5693 to H.R. 5701 are nine identical bills introduced in the House. Although the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WALTER, covers such worthwhile projects as preventing dumping from Communist countries, the bill is silent on the subject of the Tariff Commission's interpretation of the statutory requirement that there must be an affirmative finding of "injury to an industry." The Tariff Commission has ruled that dumping duties should apply to cement imported from the Dominican Republic. It should be noted that this is only the fourth injury-to-an-industry ruling by the Tariff Commission since 1958, although literally a hundred complaints have been filed during this period. The usually negative results have undoubtedly discouraged many U.S. manufacturers from filing complaints. In other words, the Tariff Commission's interpretation of "injury" has made the act generally ineffective.

If a U.S. manufacturer has a diversified line of products, it is practically impossible to find injury to the industry although the market for one product may have been ruined by dumping. For example, if dolls are dumped by a foreign manufacturer into the U.S. market, it is most difficult to find injury to the to

1963

industry with its diversified line of products. The same complaints have been voiced by the pottery industry, the electronic industry, and the fabricated steel products industry. Therefore, the Tariff Commission should be directed by legislation to interpret "injury to industry" to mean "an injury to a product of an industry or to an industry." Only if section 201(a) is so amended will the essential intent of the Anti-Dumping Act be made effective in blocking the importation of products made by cheap foreign labor and exported to this country by foreign producers who have surpluses to dispose of at any price.

Today, I have introduced a bill which would make effective the Anti-Dumping Act by providing that if the sales of a product by a member of an industry is being or is likely to be injured, the Tariff Commission should find that this is an injury which would justify application of the antidumping law. This is indispensable to making the present law effective.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 34, Tuesday, April 30, 1963, I am marked "absent." I was present and voted, and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 36 of yesterday, Wednesday, May 1, 1963, I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED MIDSESSION BUDGET UPDATING

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's press reports of Treasury Secretary Dillon's remarks to the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce here in Washington on the state of the economy and the outlook for its effect on Treasury revenues underscore precisely the kind of changing circumstances to which I called attention when I introduced House Joint Resolution 129 on the day the President submitted his 1964 budget to the House. The Secretary's public statement, 4 months after the budget came up, that he revenue outlook for fiscal 1964 is perhaps a billion dollars brighter than the President's January budget assumptions is precisely the kind of disclosure the President ought to make to Congress, and that is precisely what House Joint Resolution 129 is designed to require. It is well and good that the chamber in its deliberations, and others, should have

authoritative, up-to-date information on the revenue, spending, and tax outlook, but, Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for 1964 is pending before the Congress, not the chamber of commerce. The President's January budget estimate of \$86.9 billion of Treasury revenue for fiscal 1964, based on certain economic assumptions, is the last official word from the President, and if it is out of date, Congress ought to be told—and told in time to take the new outlook into account in considering spending and tax legislation.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the sort of budget updating I had in mind in introducing House Joint Resolution 129. You will recall that last year the President projected a small budget surplus of \$458 million in his original January budget. Before summer arrived, virtually every competent authority was predicting a deficit instead of a surplus. And as we know, the latest official Presidential prediction is an \$8.8 billion deficit estimate for the current fiscal year 1963. In the meantime, Congress proceeded with spending legislation under the official illusion of a budget surplus.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that Secretary Dillon's disclosure will impress upon the committee the merit of enacting House Joint Resolution 129 to require the President, at the midsession point, to update the annual January budget so that we will be in position to more intelligently process spending and revenue legislation.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. MacGREGOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the legislative program for the balance of this week and also next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have finished the legislative business of this week and it will be my purpose to ask to adjourn over until Monday at the conclusion of this announcement.

Monday is Consent Calendar Day.

There are also three bills to be considered under suspension of the rules:

H.R. 3887, authorizing acceptance of a land donation in North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

H.R. 101, to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938.

H.R. 40, to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day.

There will also be called up for consideration House Joint Resolution 245, providing that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate and waiving all points of order.

On Wednesday there will be called up for consideration H.R. 5555, military pay increase.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 6009, to provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

H.R. 950, amending the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency.

This announcement, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program or any change in the program may be announced later.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, NEUTRALITY, AND CUBA: UNEXPLAINED CONTRADICTIONS

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. MacGREGOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, recent actions being taken by the Justice Department, the Immigration Service, and the Coast Guard to harass, capture, and confine Cuban refugees in their attempt to carry on the fight against Fidel Castro and his Communist regime in Cuba appear to be clearly inconsistent with the Attorney General's own interpretation of the neutrality laws. Two years ago today, at the time of the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, Robert F. Kennedy stated to the press:

Second, the neutrality laws were never designed to prevent individuals from leaving the United States to fight for a cause in which they believe. There is nothing in the neutrality laws which prevents refugees from Cuba from returning to that country to engage in the fight for freedom. Nor is an individual prohibited from departing from the United States, with others of like belief, to join still others in a second country for an expedition against a third country.

Since there have been no allegations or proof of any raids or supply activities originating on American soil, the effects of the Kennedy administration's present activities is to stop Cuban refugees from doing precisely what the Attorney General has said they have a right to do. No explanation has been given as to this complete reversal of policy and law. An explanation is long overdue. The law should not become a pawn of international politics. I would hate to see "managed justice" take a place beside "managed news" in the arsenal of Government control.

The closing down of Cuban exile bases in the Caribbean by combined British and American efforts is reported to have limited the movement of supplies to the anti-Castro underground on the island. It is ironic that on the second anniversary of the Bay of Pigs defeat, credited with destroying the organization and morale of the anti-Castro movement at that time, the administration should again be taking steps which may have similar results.

Administration leaders still talk of freeing Cuba. Only last Monday, April 15, Ambassador Stevenson told the Council of the Organization of American States that "Cuba's freedom will be restored." The President himself on February 7, 1963, told a news conference that the two ways of removing Castro would be "by the Cubans themselves" or "by external action." Reasonable men agree that external action on our part should be avoided if at all possible. I cannot understand, therefore, why the administration insists on taking steps, not required by law, to thwart its own desired method of eliminating communism in Cuba.

I am in complete agreement that the neutrality laws, as they stand, should be enforced, under the Attorney General's interpretation of 1961. This would mean continuing the vigilance that has already been effective in preventing any armed excursion launched directly from our shores. There is a need, however, to reexamine the neutrality laws to see if there is any way in which discretion would be appropriate in their administration for specific cases. As Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Edwin M. Martin, remarked on April 16:

We must not allow ourselves to be paralyzed into immobility by inapplicable dogmas of yesterday.

Two years ago, the Attorney General, speaking of the neutrality laws, said:

Clearly they were not designed for the kind of situation which exists in the world today.

Two years have gone by, and not one recommendation to bring these laws into

harmony with today's world has been sent to Congress from the Justice Department.

If the present neutrality laws stand in the way of action to eliminate a regime that the Organization of American States has branded as "incompatible with the Inter-American system" then change should be considered. There is precedent within the present law for making an exception where the Western Hemisphere is concerned. A change in the law does not necessarily mean that the United States would be used as a base of operations. However, a legal relaxation might make it possible for American citizens to volunteer contributions to the anti-Castro effort, or allow groups to recruit among the exiles within this country.

At the very least, a reaffirmation of the Attorney General's 1961 interpretation of the neutrality laws is called for, or else the American people should have the benefit of a full explanation and debate on the apparent sudden change of heart now evidenced by administration deeds, not words. I do not believe that our Government should hypocritically flout its own laws. The same applies, however, to interpretations from the highest legal office within our Government.

Now, a rift has developed between Dr. Jose Miro Cardona and the State Department which has culminated in the withdrawal by Dr. Cardona from leadership of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. I want to make it clear that my statement has no connection with this event. It is unfortunate to lose a man such as Dr. Cardona, yet I am sure that the exile movement would agree that no one man is indispensable. What is indispensable, however, is a consistent policy on the part of the United States toward the anti-Castro Cubans and the ultimate agreed-upon goal of eliminating communism in Cuba. Both consistency and policy have been sorely lacking on the part of the Kennedy administration.

KENNEDY AIM SEEMS TO BE COMPLETE CONTROL

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. MacGregor) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if we listen carefully to the many speeches of President Kennedy we find a most ominous pattern developing. If the plans he outlines in carefully couched terms so as to make them palatable are carried through, the end will be complete Federal control over the lives of every individual citizen and local community. We are, indeed, moving very close to dictatorship in America.

In a recent speech, largely ignored in the news stories and completely overlooked by most of the people, President Kennedy talked about a mythical suburb, "Random Village." In this little analogy President Kennedy told how life would be under his programs and in glowing terms how hardly a single resident would

escape being completely enveloped in the embrace of the Federal Government.

The many subtle changes President Kennedy is bringing about in free America are hardly noticeable in the present budget, but they are surely destined to grow into multibillion-dollar enterprises from which none of us escape.

Consider for a moment the wide range of human endeavor, once the prerogative of freemen, that is now being drawn into the Federal orbit at the insistence of President Kennedy—programs in education, mass transit, juvenile delinquency, employment training, hometown youth corps, National Service Corps, medical aid, food distribution, employment service. And these do not include the tightening controls around our once free farmers.

However sugar coated the presentation by President Kennedy is, there is no doubt of the final Kennedy aim. It is to expand the Federal Government's services to the individual, the family and the community. In short, to substitute for freedom the judgment and the dictation of John F. Kennedy. Now does it sound so fantastic when we say that the policies and programs being pushed by President Kennedy are bringing about a dictatorship here?

The trend must be reversed before the President's aims are realized. Congress must reassert the powers delegated to us by the Constitution. The people must be aroused to take whatever appropriate action possible under the Constitution to stop dictatorship before it is too late.

PROFILES IN COURAGE

(Mr. HARSHA (at the request of Mr. MacGregor) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a recent article that appeared on April 14, 1963, in one of Ohio's leading newspapers.

This article and the courageous actions by its subject, Gov. James A. Rhodes, certainly are enlightening, to say the least, in contrast to the policies being advocated today in Washington.

As opposed to policies of increased Federal expenditures and increased Government employees, we find at least one man in these United States with enough commonsense to realize that government, to be successful, must live within its income.

Governor Rhodes obviously believes in the dignity and independence of the individual. He feels that most self-respecting Americans choose to do things for themselves, and that to tax and tax and spend is to deprive the individual not only of his livelihood but of his freedoms and self respect.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Rhodes is a man who has the courage of his convictions and by his actions is demonstrating his statesmanship. Official Washington could well take a page from his "book."

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remark the article to which I refer and commend it to my colleagues.

a lifetime of vicarious participation in sports.

"The job epitomizes everything I've been, or done, or wanted to do," he said. "To a kid who used to dream of being a great athlete, knowing he could never even be a good one, the opportunity to be one of the three top professional sports administrators * * *."

The other two top positions are commissioner of baseball and president of the National Football League. It was Judge Kene-saw Mountain Landis, one of baseball's strongest leaders, who made the strongest impression on young Walter Kennedy.

Kennedy recalls with a wry smile that he wrote an essay as a sixth grader outlining his two life ambitions: One was to become mayor of Stamford, his hometown; the other was to be commissioner of baseball.

FATHER PHYSICALLY ACTIVE

Kennedy was born on June 8, 1913, of a family indigenous to the Connecticut city for several generations. His father, a salesman for the City Steam Laundry, was a physically active man. He was rather disappointed when a childhood attack of polio held back his son's athletic development.

An operation on a foot in adolescence helped young Walter greatly, but by this time he was too far behind for varsity-level competition.

Kennedy took another route toward sports participation. While in high school he became official scorer for the Stamford pros, a touring basketball team, at \$1 a game; managed his high school basketball team, and starred with the debating society and as a student. At Notre Dame, from which he was graduated in 1934, he spent 4 years working in the sports publicity office.

He returned to Stamford the following year, working with juvenile delinquents for the department of welfare and Catholic charities, and becoming the winning coach of the St. Basil's Prep basketball team. He returned to Notre Dame in 1943 as director of sports publicity.

From 1946 until 1959, he ran his own public relations company; traveled around the world as press agent for the Harlem Globetrotters basketball team; broadcast college and professional football games with Ted Husing; was the first public relations director for the National Basketball Association, and served on Stamford's Park Commission, Board of Recreation and Board of Education.

Four years ago he achieved his first goal when he won the mayoralty of Stamford, as a Democrat, by the city's largest plurality. Last year, in his second term of office, he successfully managed the senatorial campaign of ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

Although he sleeps only 6 hours a night, Kennedy has little spare time for hobbies or diversions. His chief recreation includes an undemanding best seller before lights out; "The Untouchables" on television or a basketball, baseball or football game. He still lives somewhat vicariously, exulting in the athletic activities of his two sons—21-year-old David, a senior at Notre Dame and a varsity trackman, and 20-year-old Robert, a junior at La Salle and a letter man in soccer and baseball.

Kennedy, 5 feet 7 inches tall, 170 pounds with dark brown hair, lives in a four-level, eight-room house in Stamford with his wife

and 16-year-old daughter Kathleen. He drives a Dodge convertible and wears button-down shirts.

AGGRAVATION DAY

The originator of Stamford's Aggravation Day—in which citizens may walk into the mayor's office once a week and talk—Kennedy feels that he will be sensitive to the public pulse. As basketball leader, he expects to sit in the stands, incognito, and listen to people.

Although his second goal probably will never come true, he feels that the basketball job is a worthy substitute. He hopes to bring his sports background and political experience to the job as well as a credo that even Judge Landis could approve of:

"No commissioner can compromise with anyone—owners, players, fans—if it involves the integrity of the organization."

SOVIET UNION PURCHASES OF CUBAN SUGAR

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today there was published in the San Antonio Light an article, written by David Sentner, of the Hearst Syndicate, which I should like to read into the RECORD, because I think it indicative of the type of economic warfare being waged by the Soviet Union, and I believe it also gives the lie to the assertion that the colonization of Cuba is costing the Soviet Union a great deal of money.

The article reads as follows:

SOVIET UNION PURCHASES OF CUBAN SUGAR (By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The Soviet Union in buying up most of Castro's sugar crop is not only "rooking" the Cuban people but also making a huge profit at the expense of the Russian consumer.

This gouging of the sugar buyer at home and in exports to its Communist satellites permits the Kremlin to virtually finance the Soviet colonialization of Cuba.

The exploitation of the Soviet housewife by selling the cheaply bought Cuban sugar at from 10 to 50 percent more than it costs, further pays the bill for shipment of arms to the Arab world and pays much of the freight for the Soviet economic war against the West.

A Hearst Headline Service survey, including interviews with experts in the State, Agriculture, and Commerce Departments and the U.S. Sugar Beet Association, today revealed the following:

The Soviet Union contracts with Castro to buy most of its sugar crop at 4 cents a pound.

The Soviets are selling the Cuban sugar to their own people at from 47 cents to \$1.12 a pound according to whether you figure it at the rate of exchange based on a domestic or tourist ruble.

This tremendous "take" is obviously more than any democratic government of the West would permit private enterprise to register in the till.

Apparently afraid of the effect of such a similar gouging of the population in Communist satellites where discontent simmers,

Moscow is only exporting Cuban sugar at the world price—8 cents a pound—which is still twice the price they are paying Castro.

At four cents a pound, a metric ton of sugar is worth \$38; a thousand tons, \$38,184; a million tons, \$38,184,000.

Red Cuba exports in 1962 totaled 3,689,000 metric tons to Communist countries—2,112,000 tons to Russia and 938,000 tons to Red China.

The production of sugar in Cuba this year is estimated to reach 3 to 4 million metric tons, a serious falling off of its production which reached 6 million tons in 1961.

The deterioration in this mainstay crop in Cuba is attributed to these factors:

Castro has drafted most of the skilled sugarcane cutters for his revolutionary militia, replacing them with inefficient clerks and taxicab drivers.

He has cut the wages of sugar workers in order to meet the low cost of production represented by the 4 cents a pound price the Soviets have set for their sugar purchases.

Castro takes a cut of 15 percent from the sugarcane workers for the purchase of Government bonds, further slowing up voluntary labor in the sugar fields.

The 4 cents a pound price proclaimed by the Soviets is additionally watered in value by the fact that the Russians only pay 20 percent in cash. The remaining payment is under a barter agreement which is applied to the Soviet shipment of tractors, factories, other products and particularly military hardware.

With the Soviets setting their own evaluation of guns and planes and ships and radar, not to mention missiles, the Cuban people as well as Comrade Castro are being gypped. The Soviets through the sugar crop deal are not only covering all expenses in Cuba (despite the insistence in some official circles that the Kremlin is under a financial strain in occupying Cuba) but they have made a labor sweatshop out of the Cuban sugar fields.

Current figures from the International Sugar Council show—

The consumption of sugar in the U.S.S.R. has grown from 5,837,300 metric tons in 1959 to more than 8 million in 1963.

Soviet sugar production has only attained 6,522,000 metric tons, making it necessary for more than 2,551,554 metric tons to be imported.

Despite this discrepancy between production and consumption figures, the Soviet Union has for the last calendar year exported 894,569 metric tons of sugar to Communist, neutralist and "sensitive" countries.

This political use of Cuba's sugar results in sweet toothlessness for millions of Russians in the homeland.

Mr. President, in connection with the article by Mr. Sentner, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain data and figures relating to the production, imports, exports, consumption and stocks, 1959 to December 1962, for both the Soviet Union and Cuba.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May 2

[From the International Sugar Council Statistical Bulletin, March 1963]

TABLE 90.—U.S.S.R.

A. PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, EXPORTS, CONSUMPTION, AND STOCKS, 1959 TO DECEMBER 1962

[Metric tons, raw value]

Calendar year	Production	Imports	Exports	Net imports	Consumption	Stocks at end of period	Calendar year	Production	Imports	Exports	Net imports	Consumption	Stocks at end of period
1959.....	6,514,000	334,789	214,347	120,442	5,837,300	2,516,200	1962—July.....		275,108	54,187	220,921		
1960.....	6,721,000	1,717,244	261,805	1,455,439	6,700,000	2,445,750	August.....		150,145	38,429	113,716		
1961.....	6,630,000	3,506,890	950,702	2,546,188	8,000,000	2,808,800	September.....						
1962.....	6,522,900	2,446,123	894,599	2,551,524			October.....	105,053	64,566	40,487			
1962—January.....	181,575	41,099		140,476			November.....	23,038	75,997	0			
February.....	250,549	42,243		208,306			December.....	48,852	102,538	0			
March.....	307,753	28,949		278,804					132,150	184,342	0		
April.....	484,631	75,355		411,276									
May.....	215,801	108,547		107,254									
June.....	269,468	80,317		189,151									

1 Estimates (including changes in stocks held by retail trade).

2 Includes loan of 801,000 tons to China (mainland).

B. EXPORTS BY COUNTRIES OF DESTINATION, 1959-62

[Metric tons, raw value]

Countries of destination	Calendar years				Countries of destination	Calendar years			
	1959	1960	1961	1962		1959	1960	1961	1962
Afghanistan.....	27,819	83,113	42,724	87,247	Libya.....	0	0	0	14,863
Albania.....	1,641	1,089	1,040	0	Malaya, Federation of.....	0	0	1,576	14,930
Belgium.....	0	0	0	24,636	Mali Republic.....	0	0	6,742	21,236
Bulgaria.....	0	0	0	12,381	Malta.....	0	0	559	5,468
Burma.....	0	0	5,734	0	Mongolia.....	2,615	1,806	2,998	4,662
Cambodia.....	0	1,862	4,333	8,716	Morocco.....	0	0	0	10,822
Ceylon.....	0	0	10,530	33,647	Pakistan.....	0	0	0	5,483
China (mainland).....	4,243	0	801,000	0	Saudi Arabia.....	0	0	8,599	7,602
Cyprus.....	0	0	5,445	1,955	Singapore.....	0	0	11,639	9,781
Denmark.....	0	0	0	11,875	Somalia.....	0	0	0	9,348
Ethiopia.....	543	0	1,304	1,740	Sudan.....	8,163	28,877	62,690	23,262
Finland.....	108,723	107,614	107,025	134,963	Sweden.....	0	0	0	28,574
Germany:					Togo.....	0	0	0	1,729
East.....	0	0	0	141,814	United Kingdom.....	0	0	1,197	18,623
West.....	0	0	0	23,060	Vietnam, North.....	3,265	0	0	0
Ghana.....	0	4,846	1,383	5,102	Yemen.....	8,446	11,052	13,291	13,352
Greece.....	0	0	0	7,835	Zanzibar.....	0	0	1,598	1,104
Guinea.....	2,185	7,446	5,404	18,060	Other countries.....	0	0	607	9,247
Iran.....	41,357	52,440	101,900	135,033					
Iraq.....	5,346	11,860	61,065	89,628	Total.....	214,347	261,805	950,702	894,569
Lebanon.....	0	0	0	5,073					

C. IMPORTS BY COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN, 1959-62

[Metric tons, raw value]

Countries of origin	Calendar year			
	1959	1960	1961	1962
Cuba.....	132,628	1,467,792	3,345,000	2,231,987
Czechoslovakia.....	124,941	128,441	129,707	45,060
Hungary.....	0	10,765	758	1,122
Poland.....	77,320	110,246	121,425	167,954
Total.....	334,789	1,717,244	3,590,890	2,446,123

[From the Larnborn Sugar-Market Report, Apr. 23, 1963]

Cuba—Sugar data

PRODUCTION, CONSUMPTION, EXPORTS, AND STOCKS, CALENDAR YEARS 1955-63

[In thousands of metric tons, raw value]

	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Stock on hand Jan. 1.....	812	1,084	1,081	1,222	647	699	637	1,620
Production during year.....	(1)	4,815	5,787	5,802	5,904	5,781	5,672	4,740
Available during year.....		5,899	7,848	7,084	6,511	6,480	6,309	6,360
Deduct—								
Local consumption.....		456	350	308	295	234	293	288
Utilized for sirup.....				42	42	42	42	42
Exports to United States.....		0	0	1,958	2,908	3,223	2,743	2,774
Exports to world market.....		5,131	6,414	3,695	2,044	2,434	2,532	2,619
Total deductions.....		5,587	6,764	5,003	5,289	5,933	5,610	5,723
Stock on hand Dec. 31.....		312	1,084	1,081	1,222	647	699	637

1 Estimated 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 metric tons.

2 Included in local consumption.

Cuba—Sugar data—Continued

EXPORTS BY SELECTED GROUPS

[In thousands of metric tons, raw value]

	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Communist sphere:							
Albania.....	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bulgaria.....	118	87	0	0	0	0	0
China (mainland).....	938	1,032	476	0	50	0	0
Czechoslovakia.....	166	25	9	0	0	0	5
Germany, East.....	179	41	62	0	0	7	23
Hungary.....	0	0	0	0	11	0	20
Korea, North.....	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poland.....	161	202	144	0	0	0	0
Russia.....	2,112	3,303	1,578	274	188	359	212
Vietnam, North.....	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Communist sphere.....	3,689	4,720	2,260	274	249	366	200
Americas ¹	103	190	98	200	277	188	277
Europe.....	366	440	639	857	1,010	1,208	1,049
Africa.....	460	340	298	203	162	200	162
Asia and Oceania.....	513	724	391	510	727	570	871
United States.....	0	0	1,958	2,008	3,223	2,743	2,774
Total, non-Communist.....	1,442	1,694	3,384	4,678	5,408	4,909	5,133
Grand total.....	5,131	6,414	5,653	4,952	5,657	5,275	5,393

¹ Other than United States.

PRODUCTION BY HALF-MONTH PERIODS

[In metric tons, raw value]

Period	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956
Start of crop to Jan. 31.....	216,487	360,640	763,038	473,704	189,983	485,192	374,212	169,141
Feb. 1-15.....	436,599	242,143	845,211	808,773	455,698	751,539	644,667	546,602
Feb. 16-28.....	525,408	670,201	815,806	868,138	675,645	840,611	734,869	781,621
Mar. 1-15.....	504,737	712,714	962,011	989,198	919,473	989,798	908,525	912,916
Mar. 16-31.....	604,544	732,391	928,774	1,027,240	860,747	1,007,647	1,024,427	911,975
Apr. 1-15.....	482,471	708,895	653,265	845,426	948,163	599,734	880,137	720,915
Production to Apr. 15.....	2,720,246	3,480,984	4,908,065	5,012,479	4,049,609	4,674,421	4,560,837	4,043,070
Apr. 16-30.....		561,185	689,071	424,506	870,539	643,515	534,120	471,055
May 1-15.....		392,132	423,058	286,937	551,121	345,361	338,882	125,625
May 16-31.....		302,783	421,385	90,940	278,597	93,133	123,386	63,006
June 1 to end of crop.....		72,130	265,771	46,932	213,240	24,712	108,683	37,653
Total production.....		4,815,223	6,767,380	5,861,703	5,964,106	5,781,142	5,671,908	4,740,408
Date crop commenced.....	1-10-63	1-4-62	12-9-60	1-6-60	1-9-59	12-7-57	12-10-56	1-6-56
Date crop finished.....		6-20-62	8-1-61	8-20-60	7-25-59	7-6-58	8-10-57	6-25-56

¹ Production to Apr. 17.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it would appear that the Soviet Union is successfully and cleverly waging economic warfare against the free world. I recall that in the 18th century we were victims of British mercantilism. We are now seeing a revival of the old British mercantilism of the 18th century in the form of Soviet mercantilism. The Soviet Union provides the hub or center of the colonial empire. The Soviet Union provides the manufactured products and finished goods for the colonial possessions; and the colonial possessions, in turn, provide the Soviet Union with raw materials both for home consumption and for trade with the rest of the world.

They also afford the Soviet Union markets for their goods. It is a very clever way in which to wage economic warfare. It would appear that the Soviet Union has made the full turn from Marxism to Adam Smith. It would appear that they are adopting some trappings of the capitalistic system in an effort to wage economic warfare against the free world. It is what we might call laissez-faire communism.

I hope that there will be an end to useless and nonsensical talk about the vast cost to the Soviet Union of colonizing the rest of the world. They are actually making a profit from colonialism.

We must take measures to combat the economic warfare of the Soviet Union. We must realize that colonialism for the Soviet Union is a profitable operation. Let us abandon the myth of the cost of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. We must abandon this foolish myth that the sovietization of Cuba is costing the Soviet Government. The Soviets are actually making a profit. They are buying sugar at below the world market price, selling it at the world market price, and making a substantial profit. They are cheating both the Cuban people and the people of their own homeland.

POLISH 3D OF MAY CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, throughout the world today, Poles and citizens of Polish descent will celebrate the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day, a Polish national holiday. From coast to coast, in cities and towns,

such as those in North Dakota, Americans of Polish descent are gathering together to pay tribute to the Polish people and to remind Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

In my State of North Dakota, we have a large group of citizens of Polish descent. These citizens are among the finest in our State and among them are outstanding leaders in community and State government. They are extremely industrious and patriotic. We are proud of them and their achievements.

This year's celebration will mark the 172d anniversary of the 1791 Polish Constitution, which eliminated the most fundamental weakness of the Polish parliamentary and social system. This Constitution with its principles rooted in the Polish love and attachment to freedom and independence, incorporates enduring precepts of public policy and democracy.

This year also marks the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863. There have been several Polish uprisings against Russian rule, beginning with the Kosciuszko uprising of 1794, but the one on January 22, 1863, was one of the greatest, longest, and bloodiest in Polish history. This movement spread, and there were instantaneous uprisings in all Polish communities under Rus-

sian rule. The Russians brought into Poland 35,000 seasoned troops and the uprisings were halted in April 1865. Over 20,000 Poles were killed in battle, thousands captured, 600 leaders were executed, the rest were sent to Siberia. In paying tribute to these Polish defenders for freedom, we also recognize those who have fought for Poland over the past 1,000 years.

I am proud to join with the Polish-American Congress representing 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry in expressing hope for the ultimate triumph of justice and for a return to the life of freedom for the Polish people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a very significant holiday is being observed on May 3 by the Polish people, both those residing in the free world and those still in their native land behind the Iron Curtain. On May 3, 1791, a constitution was adopted by the Polish nation; and it established in that country, for the first time, the principle of the responsibility of the ruler to the representatives of the people. That great document established a rough form of egalitarianism, assured the peasants of the protection of their governmental rights, abolished class distinctions, and provided for religious freedom.

Certainly the ideals embodied in the Polish Constitution are ideals which we Americans cherish deeply. We sympathize today with these people, who presently are forced to tolerate the domination of alien forces, and are unable to enjoy the freedom in which they so strongly believe.

Here in the United States we are privileged to have many fine citizens of Polish origin who have contributed much from the rich heritage of the Polish culture to our American civilization. I have had the honor of knowing and working with many of these fine Polish-Americans in Massachusetts, and have seen in them the admirable qualities which were characteristic of their nation's great personalities, including Chopin, Kosciusko, and Pulaski.

The times in which we live are indeed troubled ones for the people of Poland. While those who remain in that country must celebrate in silence this great day in their history, we want them to know that the free world has not forgotten their true hopes and aspirations, and is aware of their determination to achieve once again the freedom which has meant so much to them.

I think it is fitting that all Americans should pay tribute to the Polish people on their Constitution Day, to let them know that as a freedom-loving people we hope the time will soon come when the Polish nation can reestablish a government consistent with the goals and ideals which characterized their 1791 Constitution.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask your leave to read a quote:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the presentation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

This is a perfect description of the very reason we sit here today. It could be from our empowering constitution. Indeed, it is from a constitution. But the country that adopted it today is barred from implementing it.

The quote is from the constitution adopted on May 3, 1791, by Poland. This is the 172d anniversary year of that constitution. Tomorrow, May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate as a national holiday—the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

The Polish Constitution was adopted 2 years after our own, but obviously both were inspired by the same desire for freedom and individual rights.

Today, we sit as individuals, representing the will of the people as the U.S. Constitution decrees. But the Polish are not so fortunate. Yet we know that, no matter how many times she has been trampled on, Poland has held true to these ideals that inspired the May 3d Constitution.

Let us today, enjoying the life they desire, pause to reaffirm our faith that Poland, too, will one day have again the freedom she holds so dear.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSALS: PROGRAM FOR THE AGED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a part of President Kennedy's tax program provides for significant help to people over 65 in all income groups, with the greatest benefit going to those with lower incomes. For example, the special credit for the aged would give 97 percent of its benefits to elderly taxpayers with incomes below \$10,000 and 50 percent to those with incomes below \$5,000. Although the overall effect of the tax program on people over 65 would give most of the \$790 million in benefits to those earning less than \$10,000, tax reduction would also be extended up through the \$50,000-plus bracket.

These proposals deserve careful study, and I ask unanimous consent that a Treasury Department fact sheet dated February 15, 1963, on the tax program for the aged be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I further ask unanimous consent that two tables which are a part of this fact sheet entitled "Illustrative examples to show the effect of present law and the President's recommendations on taxpayers 65 and over with various sources of income" and "Effect of the Tax Program on Tax Liabilities of Individuals Aged 65 and Over" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the fact sheet and tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE TAX PROGRAM FOR THE AGED

President Kennedy's tax program would reduce the total taxes of persons 65 and over by \$790 million a year. This includes \$320 million from special provisions applying only to the aged, together with an additional \$470 million which will result from the other provisions of the overall program of rate reduction and reform.

Under the proposed tax changes for the aged—

All of the 11 million older people who do not now have to file a tax return because their income is low would remain exempt from filing.

Nearly all the 3½ million who file returns, but pay no tax, would still pay no tax.

The taxes of virtually all the 3.4 million older people now paying taxes would be reduced by the specific proposal affecting the aged. The few exceptions are nearly all people with high incomes. Almost all of these will, of course, benefit from the overall program because of the general reduction in tax rates.

Social security and railroad retirement benefits and those other pensions which are now excluded from taxable income would continue to be exempt from tax.

All income would be taxed more equitably than under present law, including the earnings of those who continue to work, who are now taxed more heavily than those who live on income from other sources.

Older people with incomes below \$10,000 a year would typically get proportionately greater reductions in their income taxes than would people with yearly incomes above \$10,000.

Filing an income tax return would be simplified for many people 65 and older.

If you are 65 or older, this is how the proposed provisions would specifically affect you:

1. You would figure your tax just as though you were under 65, but—
2. As a single person, you would receive a \$300 credit which you would subtract from any tax you might otherwise owe. The credit would be \$600 if you are married and your wife is at least 65. The benefit of a credit against taxes is far greater than that of a deduction of the same amount against income for all taxpayers.

For example: If, after figuring your income and deductions, you find you owe a tax of \$400, you would subtract the \$300 tax credit for the aged and actually pay only \$100 in taxes.

3. If you receive social security or railroad retirement benefits, or other tax-exempt pensions, your new \$300 tax credit would be reduced somewhat—the amount depending on how much you receive in benefits and your income tax rate. Both social security and railroad retirement, of course, remain tax free under the proposed tax program.

For example: Suppose your social security benefits are \$1,000 and your other income for the year is taxable at the rate of 14 percent. You would figure the reduction by multiplying one-half of your \$1,000 in benefits by 14 percent. That is \$70 and thus, your \$300 tax credit would be reduced to \$230. Under present law, you must subtract all social security benefits in figuring your retirement income credit.

4. The retirement income credit, which fewer than one out of 20 older people now use (one out of 10 who file returns), and the special \$600 extra exemption for the elderly would be eliminated. But in virtually every case, the tax savings from the \$300 credit plus the rate reductions would more than make up for the elimination of these special provisions.

For example: Since relatively few older people use the retirement income credit, most older people would get a tax saving from the proposed \$300 credit that far exceeds the tax saving from the present \$600 extra exemption. The \$300 credit reduces taxes for a married couple in the bottom bracket more than a \$2,000 exemption would. Unless the taxpayer is in the 50-percent bracket or above, the \$300 credit reduces his taxes more than the \$600 extra exemption.

Most of those who might be adversely affected by the specific aged proposals have incomes in excess of \$20,000—but they will